

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXVII.

BALTIMORE, JUNE, 1912.

No. 6.

ERRORS AND INCONSISTENCIES IN DEFOE'S *ROBINSON CRUSOE*

I

It is generally recognized that *Robinson Crusoe* is a triumphant piece of verisimilitude, that it is unsurpassed among fictitious narratives for its air of guileless veracity. It is not so generally recognized that in securing this realism and this appearance of truth Defoe was led not infrequently to violate actual "truth" or consistency. He sought his effect not by truth of characterization, plausibility of motive and sequence of events, and the other common devices for securing general convincingness, so much as by minute particularity of detail in his statement of facts. This method, together with his unconquerable fondness for making out coincidences in dates, put upon him a task too great to be accurately executed by one who, like him, wrote from hand to mouth. Some of his slips were triumphantly pounced upon by a hostile contemporary writer, Charles Gildon, in a rare pamphlet, *The Life And Strange Surprising Adventures of Mr. D— DeF—, of London, Hosier . . . with Remarks Serious and Comical upon the Life of Crusoe . . . 1719*. Since then other writers have noted an error here and there. But many of Gildon's criticisms were petty or absurd, and some of the most important discrepancies have not been pointed out at all, so that it seems worth while to attempt a fairly complete statement of them here. However long the list, of course it cannot at all belittle the famous story.

The inadvertencies are of two kinds, confusions in the chronology of Crusoe's life and contradictory statements about Crusoe's situation and experiences. Gildon concerned himself almost wholly with the second sort of fault. The errors in chronology are, however, more im-

portant, because, besides the general light they throw on Defoe's methods, they furnish good corroborative evidence against the existence in the story of any precise and literal allegory of Defoe's own life, such as Defoe in 1720 alleged to exist. The best way to examine them is to review the outline of the story.

II

Only the events of Crusoe's life before and after his years of solitude are precisely dated, and the chief difficulties are with them. We may deal first with the events of his life on the island, which are roughly figured from the time of the shipwreck. Crusoe was shipwrecked on September 30 (pp. 69, 76),¹ so that his "year" ends on that date, near the end of the wet season (p. 117). There are no great difficulties with the first four years, three of the four anniversaries of his landing being noted carefully (pp. 114, 124, 136, 142). There is a contradiction, however, in the two statements of the time of the disappearance of the wreck. In the general narrative of the shipwreck the storm which broke up the ship is said to have come on the fourteenth day after Crusoe's landing, *i. e.*, on October 14 (pp. 61, 62); but in the journal we are informed that the storm occurred on the night of October 25 (p. 77). Then after the reference to the 4th anniversary come eight pages of generalizations, followed by the statement that "after this [probably the anniversary], for five years" (p. 150) little happened. He first built a periagua, after "near two years" (p. 151) of labor; this would bring him to the summer preceding the end of his 6th year, but on "the 6th of November, in the sixth year of my reign" (p. 152),—*i. e.*, just at the beginning of his sixth year,—

¹ Page references are to Aitken's edition of Defoe's works, vol. I.

he makes his first voyage in the *periagua*. There is no reference to what happened at the end of the five years of quiet (cf. above, p. 150), which would fall at the end of the 9th year on the island. In his next allusion to time, when his ammunition is running low, he is "in the eleventh year" (p. 160). The next time indication is in connection with the discovery of the footprint. After seeing it he cogitates for "weeks and months" (p. 174), finally reflecting that he has "lived here fifteen years" (p. 178) without seeing anyone. He then spends "two years" in terror, working on fortifications, etc. (p. 181), which brings him to the end of his 17th year. He then makes a tour of the island and sees the signs of cannibals, upon which occasion he considers (p. 184) that he has "been here now almost eighteen years." This is going a little too fast. He "keeps close" nearly to the end of his twentieth year (p. 184), and then lives more freely for some time. He actually sees the cannibals at the end of another two years, in "the month of December . . . in my twenty-third year" (p. 201).

So far there have been only three slight errors, but what follows is difficult to untangle. On p. 205 Defoe writes: "I wore out a year and three months more before I ever saw any more of the savages, and then I found them again, as I shall soon observe; . . . in the month of May . . . in my four and twentieth year, I had a very strange encounter with them. . . The perturbation of my mind, during this fifteen or sixteen months' interval, was very great. I . . . dreamed always frightful dreams. . . . But, to waive all this for a while . . . it was the sixteenth of May" that the Spanish ship was wrecked. After the account of the wreck he reports living comfortably "near two years more" (p. 215), and two pages later says: "I am now to be supposed retired into my castle, after my late voyage to the wreck." In the next paragraph (p. 217) he continues, "It was . . . in March, the four and twentieth year," etc., that he dreamed of rescuing Friday. Then, in "about a year and a half" (p. 223) Friday is brought by the cannibals.

The first sentences of the first passage mean

that the savages came again, and Friday was rescued, in May of the 24th year (of course fifteen or sixteen months would give March or April). But the statements on pp. 217 and 223 substitute for the "frightful dreams" of the earlier passage a single dream, which comes at the end of the fifteen months precisely, and put off the rescue of Friday to the end of the 25th or the beginning of the 26th year. The "sixteenth of May" and the "near two years more" remain to be considered. At first glance Defoe seems to be setting the date of the wreck in May of the 24th year; what he really means is May of the 23d year, the May following the first sight of the savages. The "two years more" means nothing, for the dream concerning Friday occurred ten months after the wreck and Friday was rescued a year and a half after that. The "late voyage to the wreck" is an attempt impressionistically to bridge the gap between May and the following March.

Friday came in the fall, probably just at the beginning of the 26th year (p. 227). Defoe makes three references to the length of Friday's life on the island. The first is vague and impressionistic,—"during the long time that Friday had now been with me," etc. (p. 240),—when he had been with Crusoe considerably less than a year. The second runs: "the conversation which employed the hours between Friday and I was such, as made the three years which we lived there together perfectly and completely happy . . ." (p. 245). Crusoe and Friday, according to this statement, lived there from the beginning of the 26th to the beginning of the 29th year; *i. e.*, Crusoe's stay was a little over 28 years, as he says at the end. But the quoted sentence seems to imply that they were, for the three years, alone on the island. In the third passage this fact is assumed and the date of Friday's arrival is pushed back to fit the assumption: "I was now entered on the seven and twentieth year of my captivity in this place; though the three last years that I had this creature with me ought rather to be left out of the account . . ." (p. 255). As a matter of fact Friday had been with him just one year instead of three.

Now at the beginning of the 27th year,

"when the settled season began to come in" (p. 256), Friday's father and the Spaniard are rescued from the cannibals. About a year is spent in laying in a store of provisions, and then Friday's father and the Spaniard go to rescue the other Spaniards. It was "the first measures used by me, in view of my deliverance, for now twenty-seven years and some days" (p. 277), a statement which apparently means merely that he had been on the island 27 years and some days, as my computation indicates to be the fact. The rescuers left "on the day that the moon was full, by my account in the month of October"; and then follows a statement that Crusoe lost the reckoning of days, but "had kept a true reckoning of years" (p. 278). This remark can hardly save Defoe from criticism, though no doubt he intended it to do so. In this particular case Crusoe's computations would have been set right by the change in the season, which took place about October 15. It seems fair to assume, then, that the date on which the rescuers went away was not later than November 1. About a week later, "no less than eight days," as Defoe puts it (p. 278), the English ship which has been seized by the mutineers comes to the island. The action which follows covers five days. 1st day: Two boatloads of mutineers come ashore and are surprised. 2d day: Conferences; planning; midnight attack on the ship. 3d day: Ship taken at 2 a. m.; Crusoe packs up his goods. 4th day: Crusoe goes on board; the ship does not sail that night. 5th day: Crusoe leaves the island after he "had been upon it eight and twenty years, two months, and 19 days." Adding the "no less than eight days" and the five days of the final action, one finds that instead of leaving the island on December 19, Crusoe should have been leaving by the middle of November at the latest. Moreover, Friday's father and the Spaniard, who had been gone only a fortnight, left a few days after the end of Crusoe's 27th year on the island; so that the "eight and twenty years" is not consistent with the preceding details. In other words, according to the details of the narrative there is more evidence in favor of a "captivity" of

27 years than of one of 28. In favor of 28 we have this statement at the end of the story; the words of the title page, which are merely borrowed from the text; and one of the references to the length of Friday's stay (p. 245), which is virtually cancelled by the next reference to Friday.

The uncertainty on this point is important in its bearing on the consistency of the dates which Defoe gives for the chief events of Crusoe's life. The only point considered by the critics in connection with the chronology of the story has been the discrepancy between the statement that Crusoe was 28 years on the island and the statement that he was shipwrecked in 1659 and left the island in 1686. Mr. Thomas Wright suggested that 1686 was a misprint for 1687; Mr. Aitken replied (1, lvij) that the date was an error but that the mistake was Defoe's, not the printer's, because "in the next paragraph we are told that Crusoe reached England in June 1687, not 1688." Then in *The Speaker* for April 20, 1895, Mr. Quiller-Couch suggested that the error is in the date of the shipwreck, which should be 1658. This suggestion Mr. Aitken accepted, in a letter in *The Speaker* of May 4, 1895, and in a note prefixed to Vol. VII of his edition (p. xvii), and he pointed, as corroborative evidence, to Crusoe's statement (p. 147) that he was shipwrecked on his 26th birthday. But what is to be done with the statement that Crusoe set sail from Brazil on his ill-fated voyage to Guinea "the same day eight year" (p. 43) that he left Hull; when it is perfectly clear that he left Hull in the year 1651? Obviously no single change in the text can set all to rights.

To return to the dates. 1651 is fixed as the time of leaving Hull because Crusoe was born in 1632, wished to go to sea at the age of 18 (p. 5), but stayed at home "almost a year after this" (p. 6). This corroborates the date, September 1, 1651, which appeared in the text as early as the 4th edition but was left blank in the first edition (p. 6). It is interesting to note that in the first edition the date of Crusoe's departure for Guinea, September 1,

1659, is also omitted (p. 43). This omission of dates which were to be chosen later so as to accord with later statements does not weaken the standing of the date 1659, for Defoe twice uses it in the first edition in referring to the date of his shipwreck, on pp. 70, 76. Leaving Hull, then, on September 1, 1651, Crusoe in six days reaches Yarmouth Roads, remains there eight days, is caught in a storm on the eighth day and shipwrecked on the ninth (pp. 9, 11, 12). The wreck should have occurred on September 16. But on p. 147 he says that he escaped from that wreck and from Sallee on the same day of the year, and on p. 311 he says that the day of his leaving the island,—i. e., December 19,—was the same day of the month that he escaped from Sallee. This means that he escaped from the wreck and from Sallee on September 19. Here is a discrepancy of three days in the two statements of the date of the wreck in Yarmouth Roads. After going to London, at the end of September 1651, he makes two voyages to Guinea, and on the second he is captured by the Moors, on September 1 (p. 147). The year is uncertain. It seems hardly likely that he could pick up his captain in London, make one voyage, and start on a second one, between October 1651 and August 1652; yet this would be necessary if he were to be captured September 1, 1652. If he was captured in 1653, the two years he remained a slave in Sallee (p. 20) before his escape on September 19 [1655(?)], and the four years he spent in Brazil as a planter (p. 41), would bring him just to September 1659, the time named in the text for the voyage to Guinea and the shipwreck on the island. But there is one more complication. He said on p. 311 that he "arrived in England, the 11th of June, in the year 1687, having been thirty and five years absent." This makes the year in which he started his second trip to Guinea 1652. I have just mentioned the difficulty in assuming this date. It would, of course, make 1658 the year of his shipwreck. If one is anxious, however, to establish some consistency in the dates, apparently the simplest thing to do would be: (i) assume that twenty-eight years is a mistake

for twenty-seven; (ii) assume that thirty-five years is a mistake for thirty-four, made under the influence of the miscalculation just before it (the two statements occur in successive sentences); (iii) assume that twenty-six, on p. 147, is a mistake for twenty-seven. These three changes, the first two of which are virtually one, would make the main outline of the chronology, I think, consistent. Of course they will not remove the lesser slips; but they are at least more satisfactory than the simple changing of 1659 to 1658. As a matter of fact, the text should be recognized to be inconsistent and then left unchanged.

III

Gildon, in his scurrilous attack on *Robinson Crusoe*, makes some general criticism of the book in addition to pointing out particular slips. "If the faults of it," he says, "had extended no farther than the frequent Solecisms, Looseness and Incorrectness of Stile, Improbabilities, and sometimes Impossibilities, I had not given you the trouble of this epistle." But he objects to the lack of patriotism which compares Englishmen with Spaniards to the latter's advantage; to the unfair treatment of English seamen; to the impieties and superstition and too great tolerance of Catholics. And if he can prevent the spread of these ideas, "I shall not think my Labour lost."

Most of Gildon's general remarks and many of his specific complaints are petty enough, as the above quotation indicates. In my list I shall include only those which seem pertinent.

P. 14. "telling his father who I was," etc. Gildon observes that Crusoe "got on board a ship, without so much as ever saying one Word to the Master of her, who we must suppose never saw him for about three Weeks, till, after his Ship was cast away, he met him in Yarmouth, and was there inform'd by his Son, who, and what he was; tho' presently after he had heard this, he asks him, who, and what he was, as if he had known nothing of the Matter . . ."

P. 15. "not tempt Providence to my ruin," etc. Gildon remarks most seriously: "If Storms are sent by Providence to deter Men

from Navigation, I may reasonably suppose, that there is not one of all that vast Number I have mention'd, to whom Providence has not sent the same Warning."

Pp. 52-54. "I pulled off my clothes . . . and took the water . . . I went to the bread-room and filled my pockets with biscuit . . . I had the mortification to see my coat, shirt, and waistcoat . . . swim away; as for my breeches . . . I swam on board in them, and my stockings." Gildon observed: "I shall not take Notice of his stripping (*sic*) himself to swim on Board, and then filling his Pockets with Bisket, because that is already taken Notice of in Publick; and in the last Edition, at least, of the Book, you have endeavour'd to salve this Difficulty, by making him keep his Breeches on . . ." Aitken points out that "as for my breeches," etc., appeared in the first edition; he is hardly fair, however, in finding no fault in Defoe's method, for certainly it looks as if the detail were tacked in as an afterthought; the reader finds contradiction enough in the first two statements.

P. 69. "for want of books and pen and ink." On p. 70 he possesses ink.

P. 70. "three . . . Bibles." Gildon wonders "why *Robinson* should put three on Board for his Voyage to *Guinea*, when one was likely to be more than he would make use of, if we may believe his own Account of the little regard he had to any Religion."

P. 104. "certainly I lost a day in my account." This remark seems to be introduced merely for the sake of the immediate incident. Later he makes two other statements concerning errors in his reckoning which are inconsistent with this and with each other, and the second of which seems to be intended to cover up possible discrepancies in his statements: (i) p. 115,—"I found at the end of my account, I had lost a day or two in my reckoning"; and (ii) p. 278,—"as for an exact reckoning of days, after I had once lost it, I could never recover it again"; etc.

P. 116. "it grew as if it had been but newly sown." This is inconsistent with statements in this sentence, in the next sentence, and in the sentence on p. 127 beginning "The ground I had . . ." all of which are to the effect that the seed first sown was lost altogether.

P. 131. "I wanted . . . salt." But on p. 236 Crusoe tries to get Friday to eat salt with his meat.

P. 136. "How I did afterwards," etc. Defoe forgets his promise.

P. 145. "falling early into the seafaring life," etc. Gildon estimates that Crusoe "never

kept Company with Seamen above three Weeks in all his Life, and that was from *Hull* to *Yarmouth*." On his other voyages he associated only with the Masters of the vessels, and on his first trip to Brazil he knew so little of the language of the crew that he could not have picked up much evil. He must have had "a strange *Alacrity in Sinking*," etc.

P. 160. "there were pipes in the ship," etc. Defoe has forgotten that Crusoe saved a pipe from the wreck; cf. p. 51.

P. 175. "I had not stirred . . . for three days," etc. Gildon asks what happened to the goats when Crusoe went off for a six days' trip (p. 166), if they were "almost spoiled" by three days' neglect.

P. 196. "looking farther into the place," etc. Gildon asks how Crusoe could see the goat's eyes if the place was "perfectly dark," and adds that the "dim light" mentioned later in the sentence does not help the situation, because if there was a dim light it was not perfectly dark.

P. 213. "if I may guess . . . she must have been bound . . . to the Havanna." This conjecture in regard to the ship,—since, as the "may" shows, it is made at the time of composition, after all the events of the story have taken place,—is inconsistent with the fact that he had exact information from the Spaniard; cf. p. 272.

P. 224. "he outstripped them." Aitken mentions "the improbability that the savages who pursued Friday would be unable to swim across a creek, or would not shoot at him with an arrow when they saw he was gaining upon them."

P. 227. "the first sound of a man's voice that I had heard . . . for above twenty-five years." Aitken quotes "critics" to the effect that "Crusoe could hardly have lived by himself for so many years without becoming insane; he certainly would not at the end of the time have been quite as intelligent as he was at the beginning, nor would he have remembered such Spanish as he had once known" (i. lxiv).

P. 272. "and Portuguese." No Portuguese are mentioned afterwards in this part of the story or in the *Farther Adventures*.

P. 274. "fourteen, still alive." This is apparently a slip for "sixteen." We might assume that there were fourteen Spaniards and two Portuguese, in keeping with the statement made just before, but in the sequel of the story the number of Spaniards is twice at least given as sixteen; cf. *Farther Adventures*, pp. 50, 93.

P. 277. "I gave him a strict charge in writ-

ing." Gildon points out that Crusoe's ink had been exhausted long before.

P. 302. "Our strength was now thus ordered for the expedition." In the first edition the latter part of this paragraph read as follows (spelling and punctuation modernized): "3. The other two whom I had kept till now in my apartment, pinioned, but upon the captain's motion had now released. 4. The single man taken in the boat. 5. These five released at last; so that they were thirteen in all, besides five we kept prisoners in the cave and the two hostages." Here, as elsewhere, Defoe succeeds in getting an effect of verisimilitude with his figures, but here at least his use of them was only "impressionistic"; in reality he was rather badly muddled. He evidently felt that something was wrong, for in the table of errata at the end of the first edition he attempted to patch things up by the following changes: "for *apartment* read *bower*; dele *the single man taken in the boat* 5; for *thirteen* read *twelve*; [for] *and the two* read *for*." These changes, which have been followed in all subsequent editions I have seen, only make the muddle worse, as can be shown by a brief review of the narrative.

18 mutineers came ashore, 8 in the first boat and 10 in the second. Of the first 8, 2 were killed, and 6 surrendered, of whom 2 at once joined the captain's party, 2 were sent to the cave, and 2 were "pinioned," in a place not specified. Of the 10 men of the second gang, 1 was "knocked down" by the captain and apparently killed (at least, there is no reference to him later); 1, "the single man taken in the boat," joins the captain's party at once; 2 are shot and killed by the captain and Friday; 6, therefore, remain to be made prisoners. Of these 6, 3 are sent to the cave; "the other[s]," number not given, are pinioned in the bower. The situation at the end of the day is, then, as follows: there are 10 prisoners, of whom 5 are in the cave, 2 pinioned in a place not named, and 3,—in regard to whom it is to be noted that Defoe does not give their number directly,—are in the bower; there are 8 in the captain's party, Crusoe and Friday, the captain and the two passengers, the 2 men from the first gang of mutineers, and the "man taken in the boat"; the total number of men alive on the island is 18.

Defoe's mistakes begin to appear when Crusoe rearranges the men for the expedition to the ship on the second day. The paragraph beginning "However, that we might be very secure" is entirely inconsistent with previous

statements, and the references in it cannot be satisfactorily interpreted. It is clear, however, from the original form of the paragraph enumerating the attacking force, that Defoe has swelled the numbers on the island from 18 to 22, 20 named in the paragraph and Crusoe and Friday besides. The corrections in the table of errata reduce the total number to 19, but this is not the 18 of the previous night. Moreover two inconsistencies are involved in the changes: first, "the single man taken in the boat," if not listed separately as in the first version, must disappear altogether; second, the two following paragraphs of the text indicate that after the 12 of the attacking force had left there were 7 on the island besides Crusoe and Friday, making a total of 21. Defoe has apparently at one time counted two of his dead mutineers as living and at another time resuscitated four of them; and in trying to patch things up, he has involved himself worse by erasing altogether the man in the boat. There is no feasible way of securing a consistent text, and the original reading had best be left intact.

P. 326. "two hours before night." Gildon remarks that if it was so near nightfall, if they had three leagues to go, and if the traveling was bad on account of the snow, it is highly improbable that they would stop to give Friday a chance to "make laugh" with the bear.

P. 341. "1694." In the *Farther Adventures* the date is given as 1693.

IV

There is perhaps no more appropriate way of concluding these notes than by quoting, from Defoe's Preface to the *Farther Adventures*, his impartial "Editor's opinion" of the first volume.

"The success the former part of this work has met with in the world, has yet been no other than is acknowledged to be due to the surprising variety of the subject and to the agreeable manner of the performance.

"All the endeavors of envious people to reproach it with being a romance, to search it for errors in geography, inconsistency in the relation, and contradictions in the fact, have proved abortive, and as impotent as malicious."

WILLIAM T. HASTINGS.

Brown University.

ZUR SPANISCHEN GRAMMATIK

III.¹ IMPERATIV ANAKOLUTHISCH IM ABHÄNGIGEN SATZE

a) Afz. Beispiele für den Imperativ "in einem Satze, der als von einem Ausdruck des Wollens abhängiger Objektssatz mit *que* anhebt, im weiteren Verlaufe aber anakoluthisch die Gestalt der direkten Aufforderung annimmt," sind Tobler, V. B. ² I 27, gegeben.² Dasselbst auch zwei aprov. Belege. Ich füge aus dem Span. hinzu: Vida S. Maria Eg. (1907) 358 *Por dios vos rruego e por caridat que conbusco me leuat*. Plácidas 132 *Buen sennor, rruégote que sy asy es que yo non puedo escusar las tentaciones asy como las tú devi-saste, dámelas luégo*. Autos (Rouanet) II 124, 424 *Y ved que os digo otra cosa: que de gente sospechosa y su casa os apartad, y, los mis frailes, mirad que . . .*

Dagegen haben nichts Auffälliges: Vida S. Maria Eg. 1202 *mas huna cosa te ruego mucho: En vaso que seya limpio mete el cuerpo de ihesu christo*. Autos IV 419, 502 *te suplico por tuyo me ten*. etc.

b) Wird einem durch die Konjunkzion *que* eingeleiteten Finalsätze ein zweiter angereicht, so pflegt auch an dessen Spitze *que* zu treten und das Verbum im Subjunktiv zu folgen. Nicht selten aber erscheint statt *que* + Subj. der Imperativ: S. Lorenzo 10 *Ruegote, mi amigo, por Dios è karidad Que recibas mi ruego è fes esta bondad*. Appollonio 501 *Mas avn te lo ruego e en amor te lo pido, Que tornes a él e mete hi tu son complido* (ich möchte *Que* streichen und *el tu son* lesen). 510 *Ruégote que non cansses e tente por guarido*. Estoria S. Maria Eg. (Knust) 340 *Buen sennor padre, yo te rruego que tu oyas mi oracion, e dame tal guarladon de mi servicio qual te proguier* (fz. Text: *ge te pri qe tu oies m'oro[i]son e me rendes*³ *mon querdon de mon service qant*

¹ Cf. Mod. Lang. Notes xxvi 97.

² Auch z. B. Mod. Lang. Rev. iv 213.

³ Die beiden letzten Buchstaben sind kursiv gedruckt, also vom Hrsz. hinzugefügt. Unnötigerweise.

il te plera). J. Ruiz 708 *Ruego vos que alla vayades, E fablad entre nos (G vos) anbos lo mejor que entendades, encobrid todo aquesto*. Ayala, Crónicas I (1779) 41 *Rui Ferrandez amigo, ruego vos que vayades á Doña Leonor mi muger, é traedme una carta del Papa de absolucion, que ella tiene*. 493 *E yo vos pido por merced que me conozcades quanto vos he dicho: é me perdonad lo que contra vuestra voluntad dire*. Im folgenden Beispiel ist der (erste) Finalsatz asyndetisch angereicht: Autos III 511, 341 (die Hirten zu den Aposteln) *Todos juntos os rrogamos, pues nos dejais en el suelo, nos dejeis algun consuelo, y el dia que nos muramos nos dad socorro en el cielo*.

Die Anakoluthie tritt erst in einem dritten, koordinierten Finalsätze ein: Prim. Crón. Gen. 390 b 9 *Sennor, ruegote que me ualas et que me ayudes en tal guisa por que te yo pueda servir et sacar Castiella de la premia en que esta, et dame seso . . . como lo pueda fazer*. Ebenso in einem port. Beispiel: Textos archaicos 50, 14 (s. xv) *praza-vos que por o seu amor vos bautizees e vos cõuertaees aa fee catholica, e exalçade a santa christindade e fazee bautizar toda a gente*.

IV. DER IMPERATIV *fes*1. *fes*

Diez 537 (= II 185) sowie Menéndez Pidal, Manual § 115, 3 und Cantar de Mio Cid I 272, erwähnen die Form überhaupt nicht. Meyer-Lübke, II § 234, konstatiert sie als Imp. Sing. für Berceo (Duelo 11, 4). Ebenso Baist § 84; er schreibt aber *fez* und bezeichnet die Form als "ganz unklar." Hanssen, Span. Gramm. 73, bemerkt unter Präs. von *hacer*: "Dialektische Nebenformen: *fes* 2. s. präs. subj. (Berceo, S. Laur. 10) nach *des* gebildet." Endlich Rydberg, Facere 125, betrachtet *fes* als Imp. Sing., giebt 4 Beispiele aus Berceo und erklärt: "*Fes, fet* sont évidemment de provenance analogique."

Ich habe *fes* notiert: S. Domingo (Fitz-Gerald) 405 *dizia* (l. mit V *dicie*): "*Ay Rey de Gloria, Tu fes y piadat*" (HV *faz tu pia-*

dad).⁴ S. Lorenzo 10 *Ruegote, mi amigo, por Dios è karidad Que recibas mi ruego è fes esta bondad.* 15 *Prendi qual tu quisieres, tu fes la descogencia.* 60 *Tu fes en esti ome la tu consolation.* Milagros 526 *Fes en aquesta cuyta alguna piadat.* 527 *Madre, si fallesciero, fes en mi tal venganza, . . .* 658 *E tu como que quiere feslo à el pagado.* 866 *Tu fes por el, Sennora, preces al Criador.* Duelo 11 *Mas tu busca conseio, fesme esta amor.*⁵ Alex. 48

*V hat nicht selten die bessere Lesart; cf. z. B. Fitz-Gerald XXIX und Mod. Lang. Notes XXIV 163 Anm. 3. Auch in diesem Fall? Hat Berceo nur *faz* oder nur *fes* oder beide Formen gebraucht?

Im Reime kommen, soweit ich sehe, weder *faz* (Imp.) noch *fes* vor. Und wenn *faz* allein im Reim erschiene, so wäre damit nur bewiesen, dass Berceo diese Form sicher gebraucht hat, nicht aber, dass er *fes* nicht gebraucht haben könnte. Und umgekehrt.

Innerhalb des Verses habe ich *faz* noch zweimal gefunden: Milagros 693 *fas* (das hier und sonst natürlich *faz* zu schreiben, es sei denn eine Kreuzung von *fes* und *faz*) und 818 *Faz*. Betreffs des Textes der Milagros heisst es Hanssen, Misc. 4: "a mi modo de ver, el testo de Gonzalo se conservó mejor en los Milagros de Nuestra Señora."

Den drei Fällen von *faz* stehen neun von *fes* gegenüber, davon vier in den Milagros. Doch lege ich diesem Umstand nicht allzuviel Gewicht bei. Mehr der folgenden Erwägung. Berceo's Geburtsort ist nach seiner eigenen Angabe (S. Millan 3) "dos leguas," nach der von Madoz "tres" von Nájera entfernt. Diese Stadt liegt unweit der Grenze von Navarra und hat politisch öfter, wenn auch vorübergehend (so noch im 12. Jahrhundert, in dessen zweitletztes Zehntel die Geburt Berceo's gesetzt wird) zu Navarra gehört. Nun weisen die Beispiele, welche ich oben gebe, *fes* entschieden dem Osten zu. *fes* ist daher ohne Zweifel dem Dichter vertraut gewesen. Er mag *faz* und *fes* gebraucht haben.

⁵Dies und andere Beispiele für weibl. *amor* bei Cuervo, Dice. s. v. Ich füge hinzu Mem. hist. I 159 (1260—Carta de D. Jayme I, rey de Aragon) *per la amor que el nos faz.* (Ib. *la maior valor.*) F. Navarra 33b *la amor que te han tus parientes.*

Daran mögen sich ein paar Beispiele für *la dolor* und *el labor* anschliessen, die Menéndez Pidal, Cantar I 236, als selten bezeichnet. (Er giebt für jedes einen Beleg.) *la dolor*: Lapidario fo. 74 ro. a. 87 vo. a *dela d.* 91 vo. a *ala d.* 113 ro. a item. 114 vo. a *ninguna d.* Nach Cuervo, Notas 38, noch bei Santillana. *el labor*: Staaff, L'ancien Dialecte léonais 20, 25 (1235) *con otro tan bon laur.* (Ib. 30 *la honor.*) 90, 44 (1267) *de todos sos laoures.* Alex.

Siempre faz (Morel-Fatio 52 *fes*) *con conseio quanto que fer ouieres.* 68 *Esforçia los delantre, assi faz* (M.-F. 73 *fes*) *los de çaga.* Besondere Erwähnung verdient der Umstand, dass der Schreiber der von Morel-Fatio herausgegebenen Hs. ein Aragonese war.⁶ (Es wäre nicht ohne Reiz, weiter zu verfolgen, wie sich dieser Schreiber zu *fazer, far, fer* stellt.) F. Navarra 42 b *fesme casa.* 44 b *fesme dreyto.* Crón. S. Juan de la Peña 157 *Señor verdadero todo poderoso, fet hi nos menospreciar las prosperidades daquesti mundo, et fes nos Señor por la tu merce que non ayamos temor de las contrariedades de aquesti mundo* (lat. Text: *Domine, Deus Omnipotens, fac me prospera huius mundi despiciere et non temere aduersa*).

Häufig in Aljamiátexten und zwar *fes*: Leyendas Mor. I 270 *Y fesle á saber.* II 42. 235 *Feste muslim.* 353. III 258. 274. Leyendas José 36 *Fes lo que querrás.* 42. 65. 172 *Fesme á saber.* *fez*: Leyendas Mor. I 276 *fezte muslima.* II 29 *Fez conta.* 84 *Fezme á saber.* III 206. 294. Leyendas José 38 *Fez lo que querrás.* 39. 119 *Fezme gracia.* 173 *Fezme á saber.*

Ich halte *fes* für älter als *fez*. Das letztere schrieb man mit *z* wegen *faz*, das daneben bestand.⁷

2169 *los laoures los que . . .* (Morel-Fatio 2311 *sus laoures las que . . .*). Prim. Crón. Gen. 268 a 19 *del laur.* 317b 15 *grandes laoures et antigos* (*antigos E, antiguas CBUOLT*). 348 a 17 *en todos estos laoures.* 460 a 2 *de cuyos laoures* (*cujo* (1) *laur* A). Concilio de Leon (Muñoz) 82, 5 *el labor—del labor.* 7 item. Vigil 67b (1274) *sobre los laoures . . . laur nenguno.* 68a *sobre el laur.* 85a (1283) *el laur.* Caveda 76 (s. xvii) *al so llabor.* 169 (s. xviii) *estos llabores.* El Tiu Xuan, 1909, 59 *Pocos llabores.* Vielleicht nur nordwestlich.

Nirgends erwähnt ist *la licor*: Lapidario fo. 10 ro. a *con alguna l.* 13 vo. b item. 107 vo. a *en alguna l.* 109 ro. b item. (Dagegen *el licor*: fo. 13 ro. b *con algun l.* 14 vo. a item. etc.)

Endlich noch ein paar Beispiele für *la arbol*: F. Juzgo 138 a, 2 *Si algun omne taia arbol* (B. R. 3 *aïena.* Esc. 6 *la arbol*). (Vgl. auch Z. 9 und 10.) Ib. 11 *otras* (V. L. *otros*) *tales arboles.* Ib. V. L. 24 *aquella arbol.*

*Cf. El Libro de Alixandre, p. p. A. Morel-Fatio, 1906, xxv.

⁷Umgekehrt wohl auch einmal *fas* wegen *fes*: Leyendas Mor. II 42. Vorausgesetzt, dass kein Fehler

Es liegt nahe, *fes* zu dem Inf. *fer* zu stellen. Hier sei zunächst eine Übersicht über *fer* und etwa davon abgeleitete Formen gegeben. So klein sie ist, dürfte sie zur Berichtigung, bez. Ergänzung dessen dienen, was bei Baist, Menéndez Pidal und Hanssen zu lesen steht.

a) *fer* (*her*)

Aragon-Navarra. Vida S. Maria Eg. 46. 66. 91 *ffer*. 133. Mem. hist. I 159 (1260—Carta de D. Jayme I, rey de Aragon). 304 (1274—Carta del Rey de Aragon). Crón. S. Juan de la Peña 19. 24. 31. Libro de la Morea 1. 3. 6. 7. 8. etc. Gestas D. Jayme 93. 124 *satisfes*. 167. 178. 184 *de fazer cosas que fer non deuien*. 226 *querie fer fazer vna tienda*. Ord. Çaragoça I 276 *satisfes*. Borao 238: "fez (l. *fer*), *hacer*; en el uso del vulgo." Ann. Éc. H. Ét. 1898, 90 *fé* (Graus). 1901, 114 *fé* (Ansó); *fer* (Echo).—Altspan. Glossen (ZrP XIX 5) 42 *por fere ke faciat omiciero*. F. Navarra 4a. 17b. 21a. etc.

Asturién-León-Extremadura. F. Avilés 100, 62. F. Juzgo 114a. 156 V. L. 23 B. R. 1 und S. B. Staaff 149 (1247). Häufiger in späterer Zeit: Caveda 60 (s. XVII). 62 *fello* = *ferlo*. 68. 121 (s. XVIII). 123. Munthe, Anteckn. 48: "Jämte *fayer* hörde jag äfen infinitiven *fer* (som det tycktes i mera stående uttryck: 'fer baili' 'fe' la cama'). [B[able] L[iterat]uren] har infiniterna *facer* och *fer* (*fer* äfven

des Herausgebers oder des Schreibers vorliegt. Der Vollständigkeit wegen sei angeführt, dass auch *haze* in den Leyendas Mor. begegnet: I 195 *házeme á saber*. Weitere Beispiele dieser Neubildung sind: Libros de Astr. II 10 *et faze en la faz desta tabla . . . una linna drecha*. 22, 32 *et faze una sennal*. (22, 33 *faz*) 23, 7 *Et faze un cerco en la faz de suso desta armella que . . . (23, 6 *faz*) Castigos 124 a Lo que puede facer la tu mano á tu salvacion, luego lo face por ejecucion é por obra*. S. Catalina (Knust) 255 *Tu non as sobre nos a meter ley, mas faze lo que as de faser*. Libro de Exemplos (Morel-Fatio) 498 *si tu quieres que yo cunpla tu voluntad, faze vn escrito*. (Gayangos) 530b *El sancto hombre le respondió: "Face lo que te dije . . ."* Boc. de Oro (Toledo 1512 [l. 1510]; apud Knust, Dos Obras didácticas 44) fol. XIX^b *Faze á los otros como querrias que fiziesen á tí* (die Hss. scheinen sämtlich *faz* zu lesen; cf. Knust, Mittheilungen 195).

gsp. och *desher*, *her* vulg. enl. Cobarruvias), hvilket senare kan utgå från ett *faer* (så enligt uppgift faktiskt i Pesoz), hvartill också närmast vårt *fayer*, vidare *traer trayer* och *trer*, *caer cayen*; . . . Jfr härtill gal. *facer fer* . . .]" —Torres Naharro I 134 *her*. 136. II 299. 350. Diego Sanchez de Badajoz I 216 *hacen her*. II 18 *her*.

Kastilien (nur Westkastilien, Mittel- und Südspanien sind berücksichtigt). Wenn *fer* hier überhaupt zu finden ist, so jedenfalls selten. Dokumente aus der Kanzlei Alfonso's X und andere hierhergehörige Texte, die ich noch einmal überflogen, haben nur *facer*.

Öfter dürfte *fer* (*her*) ungefähr seit dem 15. Jahrhundert vorkommen. Gonzalo Martinez de Medina, ["gentil sevillano"] (C. Baena 387) *fer é desfer*. Valdés, Diálogo de la Lengua 391, 28: "Desher por *deshazer* hallareis algunas vezes en metro, pero guardáos no lo digais hablando, ni escribiendo en prosa, porque no se usa." Primavera I 188 *al libre her*⁸ *tributario*. Juan de Pedraza, ["vecino

⁸ Der letzte Herausgeber dieser Romanze, Morley (Spanish Ballads, 1911, S. 87, 11), hat mit Unrecht *hacer*, die Lesart der Silva de 1550, in den Text gesetzt. Denn um 1550 las man noch *libre | hacer* und nicht *libre hacer*. Der Vers wurde also um eine Silbe zu lang.

Noch eine beiläufige Bemerkung gelegentlich dieser Romanze und ihres Herausgebers Morley. Clemencin hat die Schlussworte der Romanze ("El bién de la libertad Por ningun oro es comprado"), die er aus Depping's Sammlung kannte, für seinen Kommentar zu D. Quij. I (1833) L benutzt, dabei aber fälschlich den Helden des Gedichts, Diego [de Haro] zu seinem Verfasser (er nennt ihn Diego López de Haro) gemacht. Ich selber habe den Irrtum Clemencin's in meinen Beitrag zur Geschichte der Sentenz, Mod. Lang. Notes 1909, S. 55, übernommen, nicht ohne jedoch ausdrücklich in einer Fussnote betreffs Depping's zu erklären: "Not accessible to me." Morley nun, in seinem Kommentar (S. 169), erklärt, ich folgte "the curious blunder of Clemencin," lässt aber unerwähnt meine Bemerkung betreffs Depping's, mit der ich doch die Verantwortlichkeit für etwaige Fehler Clemencin's ablehne.

Übrigens ist der Gedanke bereits Prim. Crón. Gen. 46b 27 ausgesprochen: "libertad es una de las mejores cosas del mundo, ca no a auer que la uala ni la pueda comprar." It. Parallelen bringt Novati, Giorn. stor. lett. it. LV 277.

de Segovia"] (BAE LVIII) 41 b *her*.⁹ Autos I 28, 175 *her*. 58, 206. 328, 363. etc. (cf. Glossaire.) Alcázar, Poesías (1910) 113, 70 *herse* (zitiert unter Vocablos del tiempo viejo). Lope (BAE XLI) 451 b *her* (zitiert zusammen mit *trújon* und *crego* als Beispiele bäuerlicher Sprache). Tirso (Clás. Cast.) I 28. 49.

Schliesslich ein Wort über den Ursprung von *fer*. Neuast. *fer* < *faer* (so Munthe supra) wäre nicht unmöglich.¹⁰ Doch wünschte man Belege für *faer*. Für altes *fer* in Asturien und sonst wird man nach einer andern Erklärung suchen müssen.

Nach Baist § 84 sind *far* und *fer* "weder als *facre* noch *facere* regelmässig."

Menéndez Pidal, Cantar I 264, sagt: "El único resto de la conjugación -ère es *fác're*, *fáire*, que ya debía existir en la forma **fère* en el latín vulgar de España é Italia (Rom. XXIX 435), 'fere' Gl Sil 42, *fer* 84, 1299, 1886, . . ." Abgesehen davon, dass eine Annahme *fer* < *fáire* < *fác're* überflüssig ist, wenn vulglat. *fere* vorhanden war, glaube ich an das letztere nicht. Ein so häufig gebrauchtes Wort sollte doch in den Jahrhunderten wenigstens eine Spur hinterlassen haben. Das ist nicht der Fall. *fer* < *fáire* ist einwandfrei, dagegen *fáire* < *fác're* kaum möglich.

Nach Hanssen § 30, 3 wäre *fer* "wohl **fagere*." Aber auch vulglat. *fagere* ist nirgends bezeugt. Ferner was *femos*, *feches* und *fech* anbetrifft, die Hanssen, §§ 27, 15 und 29, 4, auf **fagimus*, **fagitis*, **fagite* (nach Analogie von *agimus* etc.) zurückführen möchte, so könnte *femos* allerdings aus *fagimus* entstanden sein, muss es aber nicht. Dagegen hätten *fagitis*, *fagite* schwerlich etwas anderes als *fedes*, *fed* ergeben können. Endlich lassen sich

fedes ebenso wie *fed* noch auf andere Weise erklären.

fer wird daher entlehnt sein. Wohl aus dem Katalanischen.¹¹ Dort ist nach Rydberg 27 *fer* lautgesetzlich.

b) *feré*; *fería*

P. Cid 1418 *fere*. 2033. 2990. 3408. 1958 *fera*. 2362. 584 *feremos*. 1055. 2050. 2547. 896 *feredes*. 1080 *ferie* (3). Menéndez Pidal, Cantar I 265, hält es für "probable que *fer* se haya introducido por Per Abbat." Ich wäre geneigt, auch *fere* etc. dem Schreiber zuzuweisen. Die Form dürfte jedenfalls nicht allzu häufig vorkommen. Ich habe noch angemerkt *fera* Brutails 64 (1357). (Ib. 101; 102 [1365?], aber in einem gaskognischen Dokument.) In altarag. Texten, wie Libro de la Morea, in dem *fer* fast auf jeder Seite zu finden, kenne ich nur *faré*, *faría*. Dagegen bietet Gascón, Hist. bat. III 21 *Eso también lo fería yo*. 22 ¿ *lo ferías tú* . . ?

c) *fendo*, *fiendo* — *hiendo*, *hendo*

Libro de la Morea 34 *fendole conuides & grandes honores*.—*fiendo* Caveda 61 (s. XVII). 76. 109 (s. XVIII). 120. 123. 280 (s. XIX). Munthe, Antekn. 48. *hiéndome* Diego Sanchez de Badajoz I 288.

hendo Primavera I 278. Salazar (Gallardo IV) 392. Autos II 218, 72. 521, 202.

Zweifelsohne sind *fendo* etc. Neubildungen aus *fer* wie das it. *fando* (Nannucci, Verbi it. 635) aus *fare*. Sicher ist wohl auch, dass *fiendo*, *hiendo* in Asturien, bez. Extremadura gebildet worden sind. Endlich ist es mir wahrscheinlich, dass *fendo*, *hendo* arag., bez. kast. Boden entsprossen sind. Das Fehlen des Diphthongs in dem einen Beispiel des arag. *fendo* ist nicht verwunderlich; wäre es erst, wenn noch mehr Beispiele beigebracht würden, die sämtlich keinen Diphthong zeigen. Kast. *hendo* kann man aus der Aussprache von *h-*

⁹ Hrsg.: "Her, por hacer, era entonces voz de frecuentísimo uso entre gente rústica."

¹⁰ Zu den Beispielen für *ae* > *é*, die ich Mod. Lang. Notes XXVI 103 gegeben (daselbst auch zwei Belege für *trer*), sind hinzuzufügen *Rafel* und *quer* (*caer*) Cuervo, Apuntaciones §§ 79, 764 (mit anderer Auffassung). Vgl. port. *raer* > *rer* Rev. lus. IV 132, XIII 365. Ähnlich *ea* > *á*: *ral* Caveda 58 (s. XVII). *Ral y medio* Rimas inf., Rev. Extremadura V 501. *rales* Rodríguez Marín, Cant. pop. III 424. Vgl. *sa* < *seá* § 3.

¹¹ Für den Fall, dass Rydberg im Unrecht, wäre noch Entlehnung aus dem Normannischen zu erwägen. Betreffs der frühen Beziehungen Spaniens zu Nordfrankreich sehe man z. B. Baist, Span. Litt. 386.

(< f-) im 16. Jahrhundert erklären. *hendo* verhält sich zu *hiendo*, das sich auch noch in Kastilien finden dürfte, wie *dijeron* etc. zu *dijieron*.

d) *fe*; *femos*; *feis*, *fez*

a) *fe* (1) Staaff 34, 42 (1245?). Staaff bemerkt (S. 314): "formation analogique sur *femos*. Cette forme (sc. *fe*) se trouve dans le supplément, qui est empreint d'une couleur occidentale." Auch ich halte die Form für analogisch, aber nicht nach *femos*, sondern aus *fer* nach *he* oder *se*.

β) *femos* Mem. hist. I 159 (Carta de D. Jayme I, rey de Aragon—1260). 304 (Carta del Rey de Aragon—1274). II 99 (Carta de D. Pedro III—1283). 100. Rios II 588 (Montearagon—1276). Marco Polo 22, 19. Casañ y Alegre, Col. de Doc. inéd. del Arch. gen. del Reino de Valencia 178 (Carta de D. Pedro IV de Aragón—1366). 188. Crón. S. Juan de la Peña 98. Noch heute ist *femos* gebräuchlich in Bielsa (Gröber, Grundr. I 847), *fem* in Plan (Gröber, l. c.), *fén* in Graus (Ann. Éc. H. Ét. 1898, 92).—*femos* Staaff 9, 10 (1211). A[rchiv.] H[ist.] Sahagún nr. 1841 (1214).¹²—P. Cid 1103. S. Lorenzo 76 *femos muy mal seso* (*muy* zweisilbig, cf. Hanssen, De los Adverbios mucho, mui i much 35).

Nach Baist § 84 ist *femos* < *facmus* "nur möglich." Menéndez Pidal, Manual § 106, 4 c ebenso wie Cantar I 271, leitet *femos* ohne Bedenken von *fác(í)mus* ab. Desgleichen Staaff 314. Doch ist—*c'm*—> *im* ohne sonstigen Beleg. *femos* ist m. E. direkt aus *fer* gebildet. Wegen *fem* s. unten.

γ) *feis*: José (Schmitz) 83 ¿*Qué feis locas sin cordura* . . ?—Caveda 85 (s. XVII) *si feis esto Tan sanu habeis quedar como* . . . 96. 237 (s. XIX?). Munthe, Anteckn. 48.

fez: José (Schmitz) 82 ¿*Que fez, locas, de sin cuidado* . . ? Leyendas José 14 ¿*Oh mis hermanos! si fez* (Text *haceis*) *mi dicho* . . . Noch heute spricht man *fets* in Benasque, *fez* in den übrigen arag. Tälern (Gröber, Grundr. I 847).

¹² Zitiert von Menéndez Pidal, Cantar I 271.

Auch *feis* möchte ich aus *fer* herleiten. Ob es auf *fedes* zurückgeht oder späte Neubildung ist, diese Frage lässt sich mit meinem unzulänglichen Material nicht beantworten. Wegen *fez* s. unten.

e) *fe*; *fed* (*hed*), *fei*

a) *fe*. Das Glossar zu F. Navarra hat (S. 174): "Feme casa . . . Hazme casa." Leider wohl ein Druckfehler für 42 b *fesme casa*, das ich oben zitiert. Ich weiss nur von einem Beleg, aus späterer Zeit, Leyendas José 273 *Fenos á saber* (Text *Hazos s.*).

fe ist aus *fer* zu *fed* gebildet, wie *í* (Cuervo, Apuntaciones § 258) zu *id*.

β) *fed*: Reyes de Oriente 320 b *fet*. Crón. S. Juan de la Peña 157. Leyendas José 156 *Fedme á saber*. S. Orosia 1529 *No 's lleguéis, hedme placer*. 1536 *Heus allá*,¹³ *é quitad las manos de la pelliza*. 2182 *Heus allá*,¹⁴ *que me espantáis*.—P. Cid 2107 *fet*. 2629 *fed*. Autos I 205, 145 *heldo presto endeliñar*. II 234, 534 *y si quisierdes batalla, hecha manos y heos alla*. Mira de Amescua, El Esclavo del Demonio (Buchanan) 1909 *Hed*.

fei Munthe, Anteckn. 48.

Menéndez Pidal, Cantar I 272, meint: "fácite llegó regularmente á 'fech' SMill 277; Milg 863; luego se proveyó este imperativo de la dental final de todos los demás, para dar al infinitivo *fer* un imperativo igual al de 'ser, ver,' y se dijo *fed* 2629 . . ." Das ist möglich. Ebenso möglich aber, und weil einfacher, umso wahrscheinlicher, ist Neubildung direkt aus *fer*.

Für das neuast. *fei* ist nicht notwendigerweise älteres *fede* voranzusetzen. Es könnte späte analogische Neubildung sein.

f) *feba*

feban (Text *hacían*) Leyendas Mor. III 158. *feba* Leyendas José 6. 31. *feban* 272. Noch

¹³ Hrsg.: "Heus allá. Haceos allá, apartaos de aquí, no os arriméis á mí. Aragonismo." Die Besprechung des *u* sei auf eine andere Gelegenheit verschoben.

¹⁴ Hrsg.: "Heus allá. Haceos allá."

heute im Gebrauch in Sobrarbe und Ribagorza, s. Menéndez Pidal, Yúfuf 50.

feba kann nur von *fer* aus erklärt werden. Es ist auf eine Stufe zu stellen mit *podeba*, *queriba* in Graus, auf welche Formen zuerst Saroïhandy, Ann. Éc. H. Ét. 1898, 91, aufmerksam gemacht hat.¹⁵ Derselbe Gelehrte bemerkt (l. c.): "Les formes en *-eba* et en *-iba* ont été formées par analogie sur les formes de la première conjugaison."

* * *

Einige dieser Formen begegnen auch im Kat. So ist *fer* alt- und neukat., *feré* ("forme . . . très peu usitée," Rydberg 56) alt, *fem* (Präs. 4) alt und neu, *fets* (5) alt, *fe* (Imp. 2) alt, *fet* (5) alt, *feva* neu (Dialekt von Alghero — "probablement modelé sur la forme italienne," Rydberg 151).

Sp. *fer* ist m. E. ein kat. Lehnwort. Dagegen braucht *fem* in Plan, wenn ich Saroïhandy (Gröber, Grundr. I 847) recht verstehe, nicht notwendigerweise aus dem Kat. eingeführt worden zu sein. Betreffe *fez*, zu dem ich *fets*, *feg* stelle, ist gleichfalls auf Gröber, Grundr. I 847, zu verweisen: "in den spanischen Pyrenäen, vom Mittelmeer bis zum baskischen Gebiet, [waren] lat. *cantatis*, **bibetis*, *dormitis* überall *cantats*, *bebets*, *dormits* geworden." Auch die übrigen Formen, die mit den kat. gleichlauten (*feré*; *fe*, *fed*; *feba*), möchte ich als span. Neubildungen aus *fer* in Anspruch nehmen. Der Infinitiv war, besonders im Osten, häufig genug, um sich zu Neubildungen zu leihen. Etwas bedenklich bleibt immer die relative Seltenheit der Formen. Daran könnte jedoch meine unzureichende Lektüre schuld tragen. Sind sie aber tatsächlich nur sporadisch, so scheint es einfacher, sie für entlehnt zu halten. Und

¹⁵ Darnach Menéndez Pidal, Yúfuf 50, wo er die Formen noch für das westlichere Sobrarbe in Anspruch nimmt, dann im Manual § 117, wo er sie für Salamanca bezeugt und zum Vergleich auf die kreolischen *chobéba*, *tenéba* in Afrika verweist, endlich Cuervo, Bull. hisp. III 50, nach dem sie auch am La Plata vorkommen. Bei Cuervo noch ein Beispiel aus Ramón de la Cruz. Ich füge aus Murcia hinzu: *queriba* Canc. panocho 38. *moriba* 44.

dann sammt und sonders d. h. einschliesslich *fendo*, *femos* etc. Darüber weiter zu reden wird es zeit sein, wenn die Seltenheit der Formen feststeht.

* * *

Um endlich auf *fes* zu kommen, so hat m. E. Hanssen's Erklärung (s. oben § 1) wenig Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich. Abgesehen von anderen Gründen, die gegen einen Einfluss von *dar* auf *facer*, *far* sprechen, so ist *fes* kaum je als Subjunktiv, sondern immer als Imp. gefühlt worden.

Vielleicht möchte man sich *fes* aus *fe* entstanden denken, indem zu Imp. 2 das für die zweite Person charakteristische *-s* hinzutrat, wie im Volksmunde *dijiste* etc. zu *dijistes*¹⁶ wurde, wie fz. *fai* etc. zu *fais*. Nur leider ist die Tendenz im Franz. wie im Span. zu späten Datums; ferner sieht man nicht, warum sie nur *fe* und nicht auch andere Imp. ergriffen haben sollte; endlich wünschte man mehr und vor allem ältere Beispiele von *fe*.

So, meine ich, müssen wir auch in *fes* ein Lehnwort, wieder aus dem Kat., sehen. *fes* (Imp. 2) ist alt- und neukat. Aber auch kat. *fes* kann weder auf *face* noch auf *fac* zurückgehen. Wohl jedoch auf *facis*. Nun findet sich in der Tat *fes* in der alten Sprache als Präs. 2, aber wieder "assez rarement" (Ryd-

¹⁶ Bello § 610 hat die Form längst als "provincia-lismo" bezeichnet. S. auch Cuervo, Apuntaciones § 267. Arag. Beispiele: Leyendas Mor. I 218 *tú me escribistes*. 356 *Si cuando dixistes á los cielos y á las tierras: Venidme graciosamente ó por fuerza, y no hubiesen querido obedecerte, ¿qué les habrías fecho?* II 370 *cuando me feristes tenía descubiertas mis espaldas; descúbreme las tuyas*. III 191 *y embriagáste, y entráste en casa de una mujer . . . y la forzastes*. García-Arista, Cantas baturras 35 *Por quererte cutio, cutio me plantastes en la calle*. 68 *Te puse sitio y me hicistes lo que al francés el año ocho, que conseguistes echarme después de estar en el Coso*. Auch port., Leite de Vasconcellos, Esquisse 133. Das älteste Beispiel, das ich notiert, ist J. Manuel (BAE LI) 299 a (der Engel zu Maria) *Bienaventurada eres porque creistes; ca todo lo que te fué dicho de parte de Dios se cumplirá en tí*. Da Baist, Libro dela Caza 181, die Stelle ohne Anm. lässt, so wird der Text in Ordnung sein.

berg 83). Die Lösung des Rätsels sei einem Katalanisten überlassen.

* * *

Im Anschluss an *fes* noch einige Bemerkungen über ein paar andere Imperative des Singulars auf -s. *ves* < *vides* und *oyes* verspare ich mir für später.

2. *ves* = *ve* < *vade*

Drei Belege (Libro de los enxemplos [Gayangos] 456 b;¹⁷ Corvacho 165; Valdés, José XII) habe ich Mod. Phil. II (1904) 208 gegeben. Ich war der falschen Meinung, *ves* sei aus einer Kurzform (**vais*) entstanden und sei ein Indikativ in der Funktion eines Imperativs. Seitdem ist das Folgende von mir gesammelt worden:

Leyendas Mor. I 154 *Pues vés y dile*. 228 *Vés, que yo te do(y) poder sobre sus bienes* (sc. de Job). 233. 237. 238. 258 *dáme tu mano, y ven* (Hs. *ves*)¹⁸ *conmi(go)*. 268 *Ven*

¹⁷ Dies Beispiel ist zu streichen. Wie mir Dr. Buchanan freundlichst mitteilt, liest die Madrider Hs. nicht *ves*, wie Gayangos hat, sondern *ve he* (< *et*), die Pariser *ve e*.

¹⁸ Der Hrsg. hat, wie oft, unnötig korrigiert. Wie *apprehendere* und **insignare* etc. verwechselt werden, ein Kapitel, zu dem manche Beiträge vorliegen, die einmal zusammengestellt werden sollten, so *venire* und *ire*. Nach Meyer-Lübke's Worten (ZrP XII 563) hat Schuchardt, Rom. XVII 417, auf die Möglichkeit einer Vermischung der Begriffe "gehen" und "kommen" aufmerksam gemacht. Meyer-Lübke verweist dazu "auf span. *venir*, vgl. Cervantes Dos Donc.: *quise venirme á Italia*, wo der Sprechende in Spanien weilte: 'ich wollte nach Italien gelangen.'" Hier noch ein paar Beispiele: Appollonio 215 *El Rey vuestro padre sallóse ha deportar, Fasta que fuesse hora de venyr ha yantar*. Boc. Oro 100 *E preguntaronle: "¿Porque vienen (van TV) los sabios a las puertas de los rricos mas que los rricos a las puertas de los sabios?"* Knust zitiert dazu in der V. L.: "la duquesa . . . le pidió licencia para que ella y Altisidora viniesen á ver lo que aquella dueña queria con D. Quijote, D. Quij. II, L." (Clemencin: *Viniesen á ver por fuesen á ver.*) D. Quij. I, XIV *don Quijote se despidió . . . de los caminantes, los cuales le rogaron se viniese con ellos á Sevilla*. Rodríguez Marín bemerkt: "Si el verbo *venir* hubiera de entenderse invariablemente como quería D. José M^a. Asensio, docto cervantista sevillano, ¡qué buena prueba sería esta frase de que la primera parte del Quijote

(Hs. *Ves*) *con nosotros*. 328 *Vés á buscarlo*. II 172 *Ves á casa de Aixa*. 197 *Ves al portero, y dile*. 219 *ves camino de Siria*. 315 *Ves á Mahoma, . . . y salúdale*. 344. 349 *ves tú á tu hueste, y iré yo á la mía*. III 115 *Ves y mira*. 132 *Ves á la hueste de los alárabes*. 263 *Ves ¡oh Alí! y criébala*. 264. 292 *ves más adelante*. 293. 294. 296. 297. 299. Als in Graus gebräuchlich zitiert Saroïhandy, Ann. Éc. H. Ét. 1898, 92, *ves-tene a Grustan*. Dazu die Anm.: "*Ves-tene* 'va-t'en.'" Aus einer Novelle, Rev. Aragón VI (1905) Secc. gen. 171 b, habe ich notiert *Veste, veste*.

Für den Nordwesten haben wir das Zeugnis von Alvarez Gimenez, Los Defectos de Lenguaje en Galicia y en la Provincia de Leon 54: "Está muy mal dicho: *Ves á casa* . . . debiendo ser: *Vé á casa* . . . También estará mal dicho: *Veste á la iglesia*, debiendo decirse: *Vete á la iglesia*." Ferner das von Garrote, El Dialecto vulgar leonés hablado en Maragatería y Tierra de Astorga 69: "*vái tu, véis vusotrus*, para el imperativo, y también *veste vete y véivos ó véisos por idos; 'vai por pan,' 'veis á verlo,' 'véste á paseo,' 'véivos á casa.'*"

Cruz, Sainetes (1843) I 101 b *Ves á abrirle*. 172 b Juanito [Comprador gallego]. *Chico, anda ves por dos libras allí de tocino fresco*. 179 a *Ves poco á poco no caigas*. 366 a *Ves á hacer tus diligencias*. 368 a. II 65 a. 73 a *Vés al médico de casa*. 92 a *Anda, ves á verlo*. 132 b *Pues ves, y díselo tú*. 192 b *Anda ves*. 554 a *Ves y entreténla un rato*. Ib. *ves á hacerme . . .* 563 b. 575 b *Sí, ves; y . . .* 600 b. 622 b *Anda ves al punto, baja . . .* Cruz, Sainetes inéditos (1900) 206 *Toma la capa y ves¹⁹ al punto á llamarlos*.

Auch *ves*, wenigstens das des Ostens und

se había escrito en Sevilla! Pero, como le demostró Hartzenbusch en carta de 20 de Agosto de 1864, más de una vez impresa, Cervantes usaba el dicho verbo en la acepción entonces corriente de *ir de una parte á otra*, y no sólo en la de dirigirse hacia donde está el que habla ó escribe."

Vgl. für das Deutsche Grimm, Wb. s. v. *Kommen* 1631; für das Englische Storm, Engl. Phil.² 714. Storm zieht zum Vergleich heran "afz. *Venir s'en volt li emperere Charles*, Rol. 2974."

¹⁹ Hrsg.: "Sic."

Centrums von Spanien, scheint mir eine Entlehnung aus dem Kat. zu sein. Über die Geschichte und Erklärung der kat. Form fehlen mir Angaben. Meyer-Lübke II § 231 nennt das mallork. *ves* "regelmässig." Auch das -s? Ebenso fraglich bleibt mir die Herkunft des leon. *ves*.

3. *ses*

Caveda 129 (s. XVIII) *Bien fayadu ses, Toribu*.

Leider kenne ich nur dies eine Beispiel von *ses*. Man braucht es trotzdem nicht gleich als Druckfehler zu ächten. *ses* liesse sich wohl als Kontraktion von *séas* erklären.

Es sei daran erinnert, dass *séas*, *séa*, *séan* ein *séamos*, *séais* herbeigeführt haben; s. Alvarez Gimenez 55; Cuervo, Apuntaciones § 282. Umgekehrt *seámos*, *seáis* ein *seá*. Aus dem letzteren entstand dann *sa*. Schuchardt, ZrP v 321, führt diese Form als andalusisch an. Ich glaube, sie auch als asturisch belegen zu können: Caveda 181 (s. XVIII) *Alabáa sa so gracia Que tantas cosas bendiño Enriba d'esti Señor: Dios por todú saa benditu*. Das zweite *a* in *saa* (die erste Auflage von 1839 liest ebenso) einmal zu Bezeichnung der Länge des Vokals.

4. *hes*; *hed*; *heis*

α) *hes*. Encina 73 *Hes allí viene Lloriente*. Salazar (Gallardo IV 389) *¿Hes que dé²⁰ grande risada De tí cualquier mozalbillo Viendo . . . ?*

β) *hed*. Cuervo, Apuntaciones § 304 (S. 203): "la forma *hé* (*hé aquí*, *hé ahí*), aunque en las gramáticas pasa por imperativo singular de *haber*,²¹ en virtud de un uso inmemorial se emplea indistintamente, ora se hable con uno, ora con muchos, de modo que es bárbaro el

*hed*²² que por escrúpulo usan algunos para el plural."

γ) *heis*. Timoneda (BAE III) 174 b *dijo el caminante: "heis aquí dónde cagué."* Lope (BAE XXXIV) 105 c *Heis donde vienen, Belardo, El Barbero y Regidor*.²³

hes, *hed*, *heis* gehören zu *he* (*he aquí*). Entweder ist die verbale Flexion eine Folge der Verbindungen *hete*, *hevos*, *heos*, ganz wie beim afz. *estes* (Nyrop III § 589, 2), oder, und wahrscheinlicher, *hes*, *hed*, *heis* sind Anbildungen an die überaus häufigen, gleichbedeutenden *ves*, *ved*, *veis*.

K. PIETSCH.

The University of Chicago.

ZU DEN DOPPELDRUCKEN VON GOETHE'S WERKEN, 1806-1808

In einem vor Jahresfrist in dieser Zeitschrift (vol. XXVI, pp. 133-137) erschienenen Aufsatz sprach ich die Vermutung aus, dass auch vom 2. u. 3. Bande dieser Ausgabe je drei Drucke existieren müssten, obschon mir damals nur zwei bekannt waren. Nach langem und wie es fast schien vergeblichem Suchen und Nachfragen gelang es mir schliesslich durch die freundliche Hilfe von L. L. Mackall in Jena, auf der Grossherzoglichen Hof-Bibliothek zu Darmstadt sowie auf der Grossherzoglichen Regierungs-Bibliothek zu Schwerin ein Exemplar der ersten Cotta'schen Ausgabe aufzuspüren, dessen Lesart an Einer Stelle des dritten Bandes weder mit A noch A¹ übereinstimmte. Durch die Liberalität der genannten Verwaltungen wurden die betreffenden Bände bereitwilligst nach Baltimore geschickt, um mir die Vergleichung mit meinen Exemplaren zu ermöglichen. Es stellte sich sofort heraus, dass in beiden Fällen der gesuchte dritte Druck A² vorhanden war, und zwar nicht nur des erwähnten dritten Bandes, sondern auch des zwei-

²⁰ Wegen des Subjunktivs s. Weigert, Untersuchungen zur span. Syntax 46.

²¹ In der zehnten Auflage seiner *Notas á la Gramática . . .* de D. A. Bello vom Jahre 1907, S. 134, stellt mir Cuervo das Zeugnis aus, ich hätte betreffs *he* (*he aquí*) bewiesen, dass "ni la historia, ni la fonética ni la semasiología se oponen á que sea imperativo de *haber*."

²² Hiernach ist zu berichtigen, was ich Mod. Phil. II 210 gesagt.

²³ Ich verdanke diesen Beleg der Freundschaft Buchanan's.

ten, über welchen nähere Anhaltspunkte gänzlich gefehlt hatten.

Beide Exemplare sind auf Velinpapier gedruckt, welches die Firma I. C. de R. IM-HOF aufweist, dazu den Vermerk GR. R. MED 1804 (im 3. Bande: 1805). Höchstwahrscheinlich werden sich in anderen Exemplaren auch die geringeren Papiersorten vorfinden. In Orthographie und Interpunktion stimmt der neugefundene Druck A² ziemlich genau mit dem Originaldruck A überein, sogar eine Anzahl augenfälliger Druckfehler desselben sind mit herübergenommen worden. Dazu macht A² gelegentlich auch eigene, und zwar meistens recht grobe Druckfehler. Im Gegensatz zum vierten Bande, wo A² von A¹ abstammt, geht hier A² direkt auf A zurück. Auch ist A¹ nicht von A² beeinflusst worden. Zur Begründung mögen folgende Belege dienen:

ZWEYTER BAND: S. 42, 11 (W Bd. 21, S. 42, 14) Ruthe AA¹B, Ruhe A². 90, 12 (90, 14) ein ganzes Städtchen AA¹B, ein gutes Städtchen A². 212, 7 (212, 9) als ein Muster AA¹B, als Muster A². 220, 18 (220, 24) Ideen der Lieder AA¹B, Ideen der Liebe A². 338, 1 (Bd. 22, S. 12, 4) unglücklicher AA¹B, unglücklich A². 406, 7 (81, 4) unter der Truppe AA¹B, unter den Truppen A².

DRITTER BAND: S. 13, 26 (W Bd. 22, S. 145, 24) in der Verbesserung N²AA²B-C, in die Verbesserung N¹A¹W. 42, 1 (173, 24) ein Deutscher AA¹B, ein Dichter A². 67, 5 (199, 7) am Throne AA¹B, am Thore A². 69, 11 (201, 12) Stimme schien AA¹B, Stimme war A². 105, 6 (237, 7) gleichfalls N²AA¹BB¹, gleichsam N¹A²C¹C. Hier haben A²C¹ unabhängig von einander die richtige Lesart getroffen, was ja auch leicht dadurch zu erklären ist, dass das Wort in den Lehrjahren sehr häufig vorkommt. 110, 13 (242, 14) äusserst gesellig AA¹B, immer gesellig A². 188, 5 (319, 12) Sinnlichkeit AA¹B, Sittlichkeit A². 281, 22 (W Bd. 23, S. 54, 25) Ziel, die Harmonie AA¹B, Ziel der Harmonie A². 303, 8 (76, 9) halb verwirrt AA¹B, bald verwirrt A². 386, 10 (159, 17) genung AA¹B, genug A². 426, 22 (199, 22) hereintreten AA¹B, hineintreten A². 497, 23 (272, 3) ängstlichsten AA¹B, ängstlichen A².

Ferner ist zu bemerken, dass an sämtlichen in meinem früheren Aufsätze vermerkten Stellen A²

mit A übereinstimmt. Dies gilt sowohl für den zweiten als für den dritten Band. Hält man die dort gegebenen Stellen mit diesen zusammen, so wird man sogleich ersehen, dass die Ausgabe B nur auf den Originaldruck A, und nicht etwa auf A¹A² zurückgeht. Für die Textüberlieferung ist dies natürlich ein Gewinn, denn abgesehen von vereinzelt Stellen, wie z. B. Bd. 3, 105, 6 (237, 7) sind die Abweichungen der Drucke A¹A² stets als Verschlimmbesserungen aufzufassen. Zu dieser einzigen Stelle hat Schüddekopf in der Weimarer Ausgabe den Druck A² benutzt, sonst hat ihm beim 2. Bande A¹, beim dritten A vorgelegen.

Wenn nun auch A¹A² in der Textüberlieferung keine Rolle spielen, so sind sie für die Textkritik doch keineswegs wertlos. Wer nämlich die Doppeldrucke nicht kennt, ist nicht imstande, das Verhältnis von ABB¹ zu einander richtig zu beurteilen. Es sei mir gestattet, diesen Satz vorläufig durch ein einziges Beispiel zu erläutern. Bekanntlich hat Seuffert im *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 16, 261 und Weim. Ausg. 13^{II}, 119, den allgemeinen Kanon ausgesprochen:

“Wo BB¹ gegen A übereinstimmen, liegt entweder eine von Goethe gewollte Verbesserung vor, oder wir haben es mit dem Fehler oder der eigenmächtigen Änderung einer Zwischenstufe (A¹, Abschrift von J u. s. w.) zu thun.”

Hiernach haben sich auch die Herausgeber der später erschienenen Bände der Weimarer Ausgabe gerichtet. Als daher Schüddekopf in den Lehrjahren gemeinsame Fehler von B und B¹ entdeckte, war er (W Bd. 22, 360) zu dem Schlusse gezwungen, dass dieselben vermutlich auf A¹ als Vorlage zurückgehen müssen. Nun stellt es sich aber heraus, dass an allen in Betracht kommenden Stellen, insofern sie auf den 2. Bd. von A entfallen, AA¹A² den richtigen Text bieten, während nur BB¹ übereinstimmend den Druckfehler aufweisen. Da ferner noch andere gemeinsame Druckfehler in BB¹ vorkommen, so lassen sich dieselben nur dadurch erklären, dass hier B¹ direkt von B abgedruckt wurde.

Danach kann B¹ etwa vom 9. Bogen des 2. Bandes an bis gegen Ende des Bandes nicht zur Kontrolle von B benutzt werden. Folglich werden auch verschiedene Stellen in ein anderes Licht gerückt, so z.B. W Bd. 21, S. 157, 12,

13, wo NAA'A³ übereinstimmend lesen: Bei Tische erinnerte sie Laertes an ähnliche Fälle. Wenn nun B anstatt sie die Lesart sich aufweist, so ist dies eher als Druckfehler aufzufassen, und nicht als eine von Goethe gewollte Verbesserung, besonders da sich B gerade in diesem Bande viele dergleichen Fehler zu Schulden kommen lässt.

Nähere Ausführungen gedenke ich an anderer Stelle folgen zu lassen.

W. KURRELMAYER.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE GARDENER'S ART IN *THE WINTER'S TALE*

In that most idyllic portion of the fourth Act of *The Winter's Tale* occurs the following dialog:

- Perd. Sir, the year growing ancient,
Not yet on summer's death, nor on the birth
Of trembling winter, the fairest flowers o' the season
Are our carnations and streak'd gillyvors
Which some call *nature's bastards*; of that kind
Our rustic garden's barren: and I care not
To get slips of them.
- Pol. Wherefore, gentle maiden,
Do you neglect them?
- Perd. For I have heard it said
*There is an art which in their piedness shares
With great creating nature.*
- Pol. Say there be:
Yet nature is made better by no mean,
But nature makes that mean; so over that art
Which you say adds to nature, is an art
That nature makes. You see, sweet maid, we marry
A gentler scion to the wildest stock,
And make conceive a bark of baser kind
By bud of nobler race; this is an art
Which does mend nature, change it rather, but
The art itself is nature.
- Perd. So it is.
- Pol. Then make your garden rich in gillyvors,
And do not call them bastards.
- Perd. *I'll not put
The dibble in earth to set one slip of them;
No more than were I painted I would wish
This youth should say 'twere well and only therefore
Desire to breed by me.*

Several points in this passage have exercised the commentators, and the result is a remarkable confusion, which leaves undetermined the 'gardener's art' to which Perdita refers.

Polixenes clearly refers to grafting and budding as a gardener's art which is used to ennoble wild stocks, but this cannot apply to the production of 'streak'd gillyvors' from the rustic sorts. Grafting is not used on carnations, and would not produce 'streak'd gillyvors' in any case, unless the scion was cut from a plant already 'streak'd.' When Page comments as follows: "Perdita expresses her preference for natural flowers, as contrasted with those in which streaks or spots of color, as white or red, are produced by grafting or inoculation, arts which she dislikes," he is writing botanical nonsense.

In Hudson's edition the editor says: "It would seem that variegated gillyflowers were produced by cross-breeding of two or more varieties; as variegated ears of corn often grow from several sorts of corn being planted together. The gardener's art whereby this was done might properly be said to share with creating nature." This might be true, and still wholly misleading as a commentary. Crossing might occur and produce streak'd gillyvors, but it is fortunate that Hudson is cautious enough not to affirm that this is *the art* either Perdita or Shakespeare was thinking of.

But when Herford, a decade later, says: "The Art is simply the transmission of the pollen from one flower to another of different color, which may be done either by the hand of man, or by nature, by means of the air and by bees," he becomes specific.

If now Hudson also really meant what Herford specifically says, then both are forgetting one of the first principles of literary interpretation, and committing an anachronism of a glaring kind. Perdita can not possibly refer to an *art* which Shakespeare himself could not have known, *the art of hybridizing by cross-pollination*. It was more than half a century after the death of Shakespeare, before Camerarius wrote his work on the sex of plants, which was one of the earliest if not the earliest hint, which the world had of the nature and function of pollen. The *NED.* also shows that all the terms used to express such ideas and processes are born in the last two centuries. Of course, natural cross-pollination by winds and bees and other insects did take place in all probability, but an *art* is a definite conscious thing, practised by man in a well-defined way for a spe-

cific end, and Perdita was not referring to a natural process in which the gardener had no share.

There are still other considerations against this interpretation. The term '*nature's bastards*' must not be taken to mean *hybrids*. Bastard never has this meaning in any of its shades (cf. *NED.*). It always implies some *illegitimacy*, *unnaturalness*, *corruption of lineage*. It is perfectly clear from the text what Perdita means. She has heard of an 'art that in their piedness shares with great creating nature.' They are not *pure* nature, but the product of nature plus art, therefore false-born. She herself, a child of nature, as she believes, dislikes them for the share art has in them, whatever added symbolic reference she may make to 'painted women' of the court, or whatever significance of immodesty and fickleness in love the common people attached to the gillyflower itself. Polixenes' argument that nature produces the art which ennoble nature and his subsequent pleading with the rustic princess to fill her garden with streak'd gillyvors and not to call them *bastards*, confirms this view; bastards are not hybrids, but false-born and unnatural.

Perdita's phrase, 'which *some* call nature's bastards,' may raise the question, whether the common people's conception of 'nature's bastards' were the same as that of Perdita and Polixenes. Deighton notes: "Nature's bastards, because of their pied color," as if bastardy might be associated with piedness as the fool's office with the bawble and parti-colored dress. Perhaps he means only that such a variation of color from the standard constitutes unnaturalness and falsity of lineage. And this may be all that the common people meant by the designation used.

Again, that the art is not cross-pollination, is shown by the usual method of growing gillyflowers in Shakespeare's time. In Porter and Clarke's recent edition of this play a citation is made from John Parkinson's *Garden of All Sorts of Pleasant Flowers* of 1679, as follows: "Carnations and gilloflowers be the chiefest flowers of account in all our English gardens. They flower not till late in the year, which is in July, and continue flowering until the colds of the autumn check them or until they have wholly outspent themselves,

and these fair flowers are usually increased by slips." This old writer mentions red, white, and carnation gillyflowers as in cultivation. This is all in perfect keeping with the Shakespearean scene, and with Perdita's refusal 'to set one slip of them' or 'to put the dibble in earth' to plant them. No hint here of cross-pollination or any crude method involving it.

Now, if the art intended by Perdita is neither that which Polixenes plainly refers to, grafting, nor the one which some modern commentators have incorrectly assumed, cross-pollination, hybridizing, what art is left to which she may have referred, which was practised generally in Shakespeare's time?

The question may be perfectly idle, of course, for there is always the possibility that Shakespeare's horticultural knowledge was inexact, and he may have thought that grafting was used on gillyvors, because slips were cut from them as for grafting, or he may have thought of grafting in a loose enough sense to include both inserting in other plants of like kind and setting into earth. Or again he may have readily entertained a notion that the scion and the stock have mutual influence to produce in flower and fruit a third product which like a hybrid shows a blending of qualities of both parents. Such notions of the effect of grafting were pronounced in the Elder Pliny's *Historia Naturalis*, and in Virgil's *Georgics*, and therefore must have been common among the book-learned men of the Elizabethan period. So these 'streak'd gillyvors,' in the absence of any better knowledge, may have seemed to the poet the product of *grafting*.

Such ignorance seems a little too great even for a Shakespeare. It seems hard to believe that he did not know that streaked carnations are not the result of a white scion grafted on a red stock or *vice versa*. Giving up this blanket solution of all difficulties, this all-enwrapping Shakespearean ignorance, we have still one other possible clue.

Halliwell notes that the gillyflower or carnation 'though beautiful in its appearance, is apt, in the gardener's phrase, to run from its colors, and change as often as a licentious female.' Also Prior, in his *Solomon*, notes:

"The fond carnation loves to shoot
Two various colors from one parent root."

And the group of carnations has since proved itself, in the horticulturist's hands, one of the most variable flowers.

I have recently had the good fortune to come upon an illuminating passage in the "*Stirpium Historiae, Pemptades Sex, sive Libri XXX*" of Rembertus Dodonaeus, physician to emperors Maximilian II. and Rudolph II. at Vienna, and later professor at Leyden. I quote from the Latin translation (Antverpiae, 1583) made by himself from the original Dutch version of the year 1554. Concerning the *Caryophyllum* he says:

"Habentur in hortis; sed speciosissimi fere in fictilibus vasis.

"Seruntur frequentius avulsis exiguis cum foliis surculis; seminibus rarius: Nam e semine nati flores ad agrestem naturam redeunt; minores, minusque odorati, et simplices; etiam si prius multiplices, redduntur. Adiguntur subinde surculis cum plantantur fissis *Caryophylli*; quo illorum odorem flores alliciant, et jucundam eorum suavitatem naribus abundantius repraesentent. Vivax est planta, et multis durat annis, si hibernis mensibus, a frigoris injuria tuta, in cellis vinariis, aut aliis similibus locis tepidis asservetur."

Here the situation is clear. The 'caryophylla' i. e., the 'gyroflées' or 'gillyvors' are a complex race like Darwin's pigeons, probably the product of special selection in certain directions to please the gardener's fancy, and run back to wild stock very soon if left to ordinary conditions; for 'plants grown from seed return to a more rustic character, become smaller, less fragrant, and single.' The only way to preserve the rich clove-like fragrance, large size, doubleness, and novelty of colors, is to keep the plants over winter in greenhouses or warm rooms, and propagate from cuttings, and never trust to seedlings. The gardener's art is clearly first *selective* and then *preservative*.

These conditions for northern Europe and the Netherlands will probably hold good for England. Perhaps, too, the garden 'gillyvors' of England may have been in part importations from the continent.

Whether by original natural unintentional cross-pollination of white and red carnations a family of mixed constitution arose, or whether by a little understood tendency to sport due to

the peculiar Mendelian constitution of the plant, or to the less understood conditions which favor mutation, or what not, a sport was produced which pleased the gardener by its novelty or its beauty, and he did not leave it to mere nature, which might let it perish with the season never to be produced again, but cut slips and propagated the novelty true to its stock. The gardener's art would thus be this selective and preservative art, which helps nature to keep her sports and fantastic self-realizations, instead of letting them perish, thus increasing her gifts of beauty. If our conclusion is correct, then Perdita's last words have fuller significance: "no more than, were I painted, I would wish this youth should say 'twere well, and only therefore desire to breed by me.'"

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL.

University of Michigan.

OLD HIGH GERMAN NOTES

1. In Braune's *Ahd. Gram.* § 161, Anm. 6, are given instances of the dropping of *t* from the combinations *ht*, *ft*, *st*. This occurs: (1) in composition between consonants; (2) finally before an initial consonant of the following word; (3) but also, in a few cases, finally before a following vowel.

The examples of the third class, for which Braune gives no explanation, are for the most part due to haplologic dissimilation: *eigenhaf[t]* ist Augsb. Gebet 1; *kunf[t]* ist O, II, 12, 44; *unthurf[t]* ist O (V), II, 4, 80; *nōt-thurf[t]* O (P), II, 14, 100; *ist wuof[t]* T, 149, 8.

2. In the Benedictinerregel 49-51, as printed by Braune, *Ahd. Lb.*, we read:

herteem herzin keuuisso indi einfaltlihero
tâtîm sinêm cotchundiu pibot keaucean.

This corresponds to the Latin original:

duris corde vero et simplicioribus factis suis
divina precepta demonstrare.

The OHG. text should plainly be emended so as to read *einfaltliherôm* instead of *einfaltlihero*. The change in the text probably resulted from an

original *einfalltliherō* of the manuscript. Compare *keghrueta* of the MS. for *keghruetan* in l. 126.

3. The last two lines of the Augsburg Gebet read in Müllenhoff und Scherer, *Denkmäler*, and in Braune's *Ahd. Lb.*:

thaz uns thio ketinun bindent thero sundun,
thihero mildo genâd intbinde haldo.

I should emend:

thaz uns, thia ketinun bindent thero sundun,
thihero mildo, etc.

In the above *thia* is the acc. plur. masc. used as a relativ pronoun. The lines would then correspond to the Latin original:

Ut [nos] quos catena delictorum constringit,
miseratio tuae pietatis absoluat.

4. Memento Mori, lines 61-2:

ter eino ist wise unde vruot . . .
. . . tes wirt er verdamnot,

may hav the missing words supplied as follows:

ter eino ist wise unde vruot, tes wirt er gese-
ginot:
ter ander ist tumb unde unvruot, tes wirt er
verdamnot.

The repetition of *vruot tes wirt er* caused the copyist to omit the second half of l. 61 and the first half of l. 62.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

SOME ENGLISH BLENDS

To the examples of contaminated forms in English that I hav given elsewhere,¹ add the following²:

1. *Blange*, *blon(d)ge*, *blenge* 'mix,' 'mixture': *bl(end)* + *(ch)ange*.

2. *Blash* 'flash, sudden blaze or flame,' 'blaze, flare up suddenly': *bl(aze)* + *(fl)ash*. Or *blash* may be a derivativ of the root in *blaze* just as *flash* is from the root in Swed. dial. *flasa* 'flame, blaze,' NE. dial. *flaze*. But the two sets of words certainly influenced each other.

¹ Cf. especially *Mod. Phil.* ix, 173 ff.

² Examples, unless otherwise indicated, ar taken from Wright's *Eng. Dial. Dict.*

3. *Blash* 'a splash or dash of liquid or mud; a hevvy fall of rain or sleet; liquid, soft mud; weak trashy stuff; nonsense, foolish talk,' 'splash liquid or mud about, etc.,' *blashy* 'rainy, wet, gusty; wet, muddy, splashy, sloppy, etc.': *bl(ow)*, probably in both senses + *-ash* from such words as *splash*, *plash*, *dash*, *flash*.

4. *Flounge* 'the act of plunging, floundering in mire': *flou(nder)* + *(plu)nge*.

5. *Foodle* 'fondle, caress' (as: "They'd coodle thee an' foodle thee"): *f(ondle)* + *(c)oodle*, dial. for *cuddle*.

6. *Fooster*, *fouster* 'bustle about, work hard; fuss or fumble about in a futile, purposeless way,' *sb.* 'bustle, activity': *footer* 'bungle, potter about, fuss or fidget about,' *sb.* 'bungle, confusion' + *-s-* from *fuss*.

7. *Fustle* 'bustle, hurry about, make a fuss,' *sb.* 'fuss, bustle': *f(uss)* + *(b)ustle*.

8. *Plounce* 'plunge with a loud noise': *pl(unge)* + *(fl)ounce*.

9. *Plop* 'plunge, flop; fall or drop suddenly into water; pop, go off hastily,' *ploppy* 'soft, fat': *pl-* from *plunge* (compare also *plunk*, *plump*, dial. *plout* 'splash; fall with a splash or sudden drop') + *-op* from such words as *flop*, *drop*, *pop*.

10. *Pluff* 'emit a short, sharp breth; swell, puff up,' *adj.* 'puft up, soft, spongy,' *pluffy* 'fat, swollen, chubby; soft, porous, spongy,' *ploffy* 'fat, plump; soft and spongy' (with which compare East Fries. *pluffen* 'dumpf od. dröhnend fallen u. niederschlagen, puffen, dumpf knallen,' Du. *ploffen*, etc.): *pi(ump)* (compare NHG. *plump*, *plumpfen*) + *(p)uff*.

11. *Quee-quaw sb.* and *v.* 'see-saw' is modeld on *see-saw* from *quee-*, abstracted from *queagle* 'see-saw,' *queedle* 'oscillate, shake; totter.'

12. *Squalm*, a dialect form of *qualm*, *squalmish* 'squeamish': *s(queamish)* + *qualm*. *Squalmish* is also used in America in the sense of 'qualmish, nauseated,' as: "I kept getting more and more *squalmish*," the remark of a lady on her experience at sea.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

HENRY FIELDING AND *THE CRISIS*

Speaking of Henry Fielding's declaration in the Preface to the *Miscellanies* of 1743, of having published since "the End of June 1741" only what he enumerates in the Preface, Mr. Dobson says (*Fielding*, 1905 edition, page 72): ". . . provided it can be placed before this date [i. e., end of June 1741], he may be credited with a political sermon called the *Crisis* (1741), which is ascribed to him upon the authority of a writer in Nichols's *Anecdotes*." I believe that attention has not yet been called to the following notices: *Gentleman's Magazine*, Register of Books for April 1741, "5. The Crisis. A Sermon on Rev. xiv. 9, 10, 11. Price 6 d. A. Dodd."; *London Magazine* book list for the same month, the same notice.

The passage in Nichols (*Literary Anecdotes of the 18th Century*, VIII, 446; reprinted by Lawrence, *Life of Fielding*, page 145, note) reads as follows: "I possess a pamphlet, intitled, 'The Crisis; a Sermon on Rev. xiv. 9, 10, 11; necessary to be preached in all the Churches in England, Wales, and Berwick-upon-Tweed, at or before the next General Election; humbly inscribed to the Right Reverend the Bench of Bishops. By a Lover of his Country. —Vendidit hic Auro Patriam. Virg.—London, printed for A. Dodd, without Temple Bar; E. Nutt, at the Royal Exchange; and H. Chapelle, in Grosvenor-street, 1741,' 8vo; on the title-page of which is this remark: 'This Sermon was written by the late Mr. Fielding, Author of Tom Jones, &c. &c. as the Printer of it assured me. R. B.'"

It is very likely that in 1741 Fielding would write a pamphlet of the general class of the *Crisis*. His fondness for "sermons" at this period is shown by his *Champion* references to South, Tillotson, and Clerk; by the nature of the themes and of the form of a number of his discourses in the *Champion*; and by the nature of a large part of the prose matter of the *Miscellanies* of 1743 including parts of *Jonathan Wild*. His great interest in politics at this time is shown in the *Champion* (a point

not yet sufficiently emphasized), and in the *Vernoniad* and the *Opposition* of 1741.

The following will indicate that Fielding might well print a 1741 work through Chapelle and Dodd.

"H. Chapelle," one of the publishers of the *Crisis*, was on June 29, 1741 present at the meeting of the partners in the *Champion* as a partner with Fielding and five others. At this meeting the 1741 reprinted edition of the *Champion* was knocked down at auction to Mr. Henry Chapelle (see Godden, *Henry Fielding, a Memoir*, pages 115-6). Chapelle's name appears as that of the publisher on the title-page of the 1743 edition of the reprinted *Champion*. Further, that in April 1741 Fielding had relations with Chapelle, is shown by his order: "Mr Nourse, Please to deliver Mr Chappell 50 of my [sic] True Greatness and 50 of the *Vernoniad*. Yr Hen. Ffielding. April 20 1741" (see Godden, page 115).

Dodd had connection with Fielding in 1728 when with J. Roberts he issued the separate edition of the *Masquerade*. The *Covent Garden Journal* of 1752 was "Printed, and Sold by Mrs. Dodd, at the Peacock, Temple Bar," the old stand of Dodd.

It is worth noting that up to and including 1736¹ all of Fielding's publications with two exceptions were apparently issued through John Watts at the Printing-Office in Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn-Fields and J. Roberts in Warwick-Lane, together or singly. The exceptions are the 1728 separately issued *Masquerade*, Printed for J. Roberts and A. Dodd at the Peacock, without Temple-bar; and the 1731 *Welsh Opera*, "Printed for E. Rayner." But after 1736 and up to 1743, Fielding went from publisher to publisher. In 1737 the *Historical Register* was announced in the June *Gentleman's Magazine* without publisher's name; the 1739-40 *Champion* was "Printed for C. Chandler, Bookbinder, at the Bible in Ship-Yard, near the Ship Tavern, without Temple-Bar";

¹ A convenient list of Fielding's first editions may be found in Henley's edition, volume XVI, *Miscellaneous Writings*, volume III, pp. xlvii ff.

the 1741 *Of True Greatness* was issued by Corbett; the 1741 reprint of the *Champion* was "Printed for J. Huggonson in *Sword and Buckler Court*"; the 1741 *Vernoniad* was "Printed for Charles Corbett, at Addison's Head against St. Dunstan's Church, Fleet-street"; the 1742 (really December 1741, see *Gentleman's Magazine* of December 1741) *Opposition* was "Printed for T. Cooper, at the Globe in Pater-noster-Row"; the 1742 *Joseph Andrews* and *Miss Lucy in Town* were "Printed for A. Millar [over-]against St. Clement's Church, in the Strand"; the 1742 *Plutus* was "Printed for T. Waller in the Temple-Cloisters"; the 1742 *Full Vindication of the Dutchess Dowager of Marlborough* was "Printed for J. Roberts, in Warwick-Lane." All the later works after 1742, except the periodicals (the *True Patriot*, the *Jacobite's Journal*, the *Covent Garden Journal*) and the 1747 *Proper Answer to a Late Scurrilous Libel* (which was printed by or for Cooper), were printed by or for A. Millar in the Strand.

It would appear, then, that from the end of 1736 to the end of 1742 Fielding had not a fixed publisher, as he had before 1737 and after 1742. But of the eight publications (exclusive of the *Champion*) of 1737-1742 inclusive, Corbett and Millar surely printed two. Millar's two were issued in 1742. In April 1741, then, Fielding was very likely to carry a work he had for print to any bookseller who might be at the time most available. Chapelle he was acquainted with through the *Champion* and its affairs, and in April 1741 he was dealing with him in connection with the *Vernoniad* and *Of True Greatness*. Dodd was at the Peacock without Temple Bar close to Fielding's legal haunts, and had already had connection with Fielding through the *Masquerade* in 1728.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

Beloit College.

AN IDIOM OF THE COMPARATIVE IN ANGLO-SAXON

Grein (*Sprachschatz*, II, 1864, p. 563 f.) was the first to bring together passages in Anglo-Saxon poetry that were involved in the use of what he interpreted to be an anacoluthic comparative with *þonne*. Since then these passages have perplexed the grammarian and the annotator. Among recent attempts to contribute to the explanation of the idiom is that of Professor Koepfel, who, in *Englische Studien*, xxx, 376 f., gives indirect support to Grein by an appeal to what he believes to be a similar idiom, "welche ebenfalls das fehlen eines komparativs vor *than* aufweist." He cites two examples from the dramatists in which *rather* of the formula *rather . . . than* is suppressed.

Several of passages usually considered in this connection may be dismissed at once from further attention. That *Exodus* 373 furnishes an instance merely of a simplification of consonants in the comparative of adjectives in *-r* has been shown in a previous number of this periodical (xxvii, 18); and the same explanation is applicable to *Christ and Satan*, 213 and 389 (Grein-Wülker, II, 534, 543; Sievers, *Beiträge*, x, 499; Groschopp, *Anglia*, vi, 267, shows that the late 'corrector' was inaccurate).

In the next citation (*Ps. cxvii*, 8, 9) there is a clear exhibition of an idiom that requires an explanation:

Gōd ys on Dryhten georne tō þenceanne
þonne on mannan wese mōd tō trēowianne.
Gōd ys on Dryhten georne tō hyhtanne
þonne on ealdormenn āhwær tō trēowianne.

The point of the present inquiry is revealed in the close adherence of these lines to the Latin original:

"*Bonum est confidere in Domino, quam confidere in homine. Bonum est sperare in Domino, quam sperare in principibus.*"

What the Anglo-Saxon translator has here done in the way of subordinating idiom to a reverential transference of the exact word is so completely in accordance with the prevailing method of translating Scripture that one may expect this particular detail to be treated else-

where in exactly the same manner. This is just what one finds, for example, in Richard Rolle of Hampole's Psalter (ed. Bramley): "Goed it is to trayst in lord; than to trayst in man," etc.; also in the *Versio Antiqua Gallica* (ed. Michel, 1860): "Bone chose est after el Segnor, que fier en hume," etc.; and in the earliest Wycliffite version (ed. Forshall and Madden): "Good is to trostnen . . . than," etc. A noticeable change is introduced into the second text of this last version: "It is betere for to trist . . . than," etc. A parallel to this variation occurs at *Mt.* xviii, 8, 9, and *Mk.* ix, 42, 43, the first text having *good . . . than*, and the second, *betere . . . than*; and this variation corresponds to the Anglo-Saxon glosses in the Lindisfarne ms. (ed. Skeat): *god ð betra* (or *betra ð god*) . . . *ðon*.¹

A glance at the two Hieronymian texts of the Psalter (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, xxix and xxviii) discovers the same variation between the forms of the adjective in the passage cited. The earliest text, revised in adherence to the Septuagint has the positive *bonum*, which has become the Vulgate reading; but the comparative *melius* takes its place in the second version, which was based on the Hebrew text. Manifestly, therefore, the positive form belongs to the Hellenistic tradition, and the true comparative form is confirmed by the Hebrew text.

Looking now at the Hebrew method of expressing comparison with the positive form of the adjective and the preposition *min*, 'from,' the whole matter becomes clear. The Hellenistic positive, which has been carried into the Latin, is a Hebraism, distorted by an irrational retention of *ἤ* in Greek and of *quam* in Latin. The

resultant enallage is, therefore, not truly an idiom in N. T. Greek, Vulgate Latin, Anglo-Saxon, and the other languages of translations based on the Vulgate. The false idiom was corrected by Jerome when he came to make direct use of the Hebrew text; and the plain demand of the sense (as the Glosses show), the influence of Jerome's second Psalter, and in some instances, presumably, a knowledge of Hebrew must be thought of in connection with the variations and corrections in the early European versions.

In the case of *Ps.* xviii, 8, 9, the Anglo-Saxon translator has, therefore, mechanically adhered to the Latin form of a Hebraism of the Septuagint (*ἀγαθὸν . . . ἤ*). This comparative, consisting of the positive form of the adjective followed by *ἤ* altho of frequent occurrence in the Septuagint is, according to Winer (*A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*, translated by W. F. Moulton, 3d ed., 1882, p. 302), found only once in the *N. T.*, but in both records, namely, *Mt.*, xviii, 8 [and 9] and *Mk.*, ix, 43, 45. But this does not mark the limits of the influence of the Hebrew comparative. This influence has affected both Greek and Latin grammar in a manner that is difficult of precise determination. To refer to one aspect of the question, it is noteworthy that the Hebrew prepositional comparative, as it may be called, could be satisfactorily imitated in Greek by the use of *ὑπὲρ* or *παρα* (Fr. Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentl. Griechisch*, 2d ed., 1902, p. 144). What was thus done in Greek (with notable facility) could also be done in Latin and even in English, as is shown in the history of the expression "Think ye that these Galilæans were sinners *above* all the Galilæans" (*Luke* xiii, 2). A similar story precedes the modern form of "justified rather than the other" of *Luke* xviii, 14. Here the variant reading *παρα* (Blass, *op. cit.*, p. 144) is succeeded by the Latin *ab*; and when the Anglo-Saxon glossator is discovered to retain *from him* (*ab illo*) and the Wycliffite translator to write "iustified fro the other," the persistence of method is strongly emphasized.

But there is a residuum of Anglo-Saxon passages involved in the question under discussion. Of these the passage in the *Beowulf* (ll. 69-70: *micel . . . þonne*) has attracted most attention. *Elene* 646-647 has also *mycel . . . þonne*, and this closes the list for the poetry. Bugge was the

¹My colleague, Professor W. Kurrelmeyer, kindly points me to the same variation in the early German Psalters. Thus, Notker has the comparative form, *bezere* (*pezzere*), but the Windberg (interlinear) Psalter (E. G. Graff, *Deutsche Interlinearversionen der Psalmen*, 1839) has *Guot . . . denne*; and in like manner, the Trier Psalter has *Gut . . . wande*. "Like Notker," says Professor Kurrelmeyer, "the text of the printed Bible, as represented by the earliest editions of Mentel, Eggenstein, and Pflanzmann, has *Besser ist*. So also the Wolfenbüttel ms. In the fourth edition of the printed text, published by Zainer ca. 1475, *Guot* is substituted, and this reading persists in the following eight editions, down to 1518. In other places also, Zainer used the Vulgate to normalize his text."

first to point to an example of the construction in the prose. In *Zacher's Zeitschrift* iv (1873), 193, he refers to the *Epist. Alex. ad Arist.*, Fol. 108b (*Anglia* iv, 154, ll. 405-406), and censures Cockayne for not accepting the reading *swiðe . . . þonne*. It may be added that Wülker (*Anglia* i, 185), by a surprising inadvertence, declared that another example was to be found in the closing lines of the second book of the *Orosius*. Two instances of *micel* and one of *swiðe* followed by *þonne* remain, therefore, to be explained.

One is inclined to begin here with an elimination of the example from the prose. At all events it is highly probable that this single occurrence of *swiðe* for *swiðor* is merely a scribal error. Holder (*Anglia* i, 510) reports no defect in the ms. at this point. But the passage in the *Elene* begets only certainty of its incorrectness, and it is a matter of genuine amazement to find that the suggestion made by Grimm, in the first annotated edition of the poem (1840), has not prevented subsequent editors from adhering to a reading that is so unmistakably illogical. Grimm obviously restored the sense of the lines by proposing to read *þæt was fyr micle*, 'fuit multo remotius'; and his substitution of *fyr(r)* for *fær* accords with the repeated use of *fyrn* in the context (632, 641). That this most plausible mending of these words has not been accepted as final does not, of course, disprove the necessity of making some change in the transmitted text, and this necessity deprives the example of valid evidence in the present discussion, which is now thus reduced to the consideration of the lines in the *Beowulf*.

To come to close quarters with *Beowulf* 69-70, if the construction be assumed to have been copied correctly (allowing ms. *þone* to be intended for *þonne*), its solitary occurrence beyond the direct influence of the Septuagint-Vulgate tradition becomes very difficult of explanation. On the other hand, if it be assumed that the scribe has here blundered, efforts should be renewed to correct his error by conjecture. But the first assumption is further weakened by the manifest inaccessibility of Anglo-Saxon to the foreign idiom, as is shown by its rejection from the version of the Gospels and by its unfavorable treatment even in the Glosses. And surely this sole example (with only the most doubtful bit of sup-

port in an isolated instance of *swiðe . . . þonne*) is altogether insufficient to warrant the expectation of a use of *þonne* that would be parallel to such an occasional use of *quam* as is found especially in African latinity (Stolz und Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.*, 4th ed., 1910, pp. 547 f.). From every point of view *Beowulf* 69-70 almost certainly contains a scribal mistake.

The foregoing discussion must make clearer the two-fold importance of the critical examination of the *Beowulf* passage. It is, of course, desirable to recover, by conjecture, more nearly the exact words in which the obvious sense of the lines was originally expressed; and it is, in a sense, still more desirable to dismiss from the text the false evidence of a strange idiom. In conclusion, I therefore submit for consideration the following reading of line 69:

medo-ærn micle (or *micele*) *mære gewyrcean*

Cosijn (*Aanteekeningen op den Beowulf*, Leiden, 1892, p. 1) suggested *medo-ærn mære*, but it is more probable that the scribe converted *micle* into *micel*. His eye may have been misled by *micel* of line 67, or he may have hastily considered *micel* to be necessary to complete the form of the appositive of *þæt heal-reced*. In some such way he would be led to substitute the unnecessary (but not ungrammatical) *man* for *mære*. That the scribe proceeded to begin the next line with an ungrammatical *þone* also confirms the judgment that his mental operations at this point were somewhat confused.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

SPENSER'S *FAERIE QUEENE*, BOOK III,
CANTO VI, ST. 11 ff., AND MOSCHUS'S
IDYL, *LOVE THE RUNAWAY*

In a gloss to the *Shepherd's Calendar*, the March Eclogue, l. 79, E. K. remarks: "But who liste more at large to behold Cupids colours and furniture, let him reade ether Propertius or Moschus his Idyllion of wandring love being now most excellently translated into Latine, by the singuler learned man Angelus Politianus: whych worke I have seene, amongst other of thys Poets

doings, very wel translated also into English Rymes." Spenser's *Minor Poems*, edited by Ernest De Sélincourt, p. 34 (Oxford, 1910). Now, it has long been recognized that the incident of Venus's search for Cupid, which forms a part of the story of Belpheobe's birth in the *Faerie Queene*, Book III, Canto vi, was connected with the above-mentioned idyl. But have we preserved in these stanzas the translation with which E. K. was acquainted at the time that the *Shepherd's Calendar* was published? Certainly, they could be termed a translation only in a very loose sense. In a paper on *Spenser's Lost Poems*, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXIII, p. 94 (1908), P. M. Buck calls the passage "rather an expansion of Moschus than a translation." So, too, Miss H. E. Sandison, *ibid.*, xxv, p. 145 (1910), who accepts it, however (like Buck, apparently), as the work to which E. K. refers. The Elizabethans used "translation" in a very comprehensive sense, but it is safe to say that Spenser's commentator did not have in mind the lines we read in the *Faerie Queene*. In the first place, these lines are in the Spenserian stanza-form and it is, of course, in the highest degree unlikely that Spenser would have employed that metrical form in turning this dainty little poem into English rime. In the second place, I wish to point out that in these stanzas Spenser's expansion of the *motif* which he first knew from Moschus is determined by the Prologue to Tasso's *Aminta*. In writing this Prologue Tasso, himself, obviously is plainly embroidering on Moschus's Idyl.¹ The *Aminta*, I may remark, though acted in 1573, was not printed until 1581. I will give now first the

¹ Tasso's *Amore Fuggitivo* is also inspired by Moschus's idyl, but it does not resemble the stanzas in the *Faerie Queene*. In st. 45 of this same canto Spenser speaks of "Amintas wretched fate To whom sweet Poets verse hath given endlesse date." The allusion, however, is not to Tasso but to Thomas Watson's Latin pastoral *Amyntas* (1585) or the translation of it by Abraham Fraunce (1587)—possibly both. See E. Koepfel, *Anglia*, xi, 28 (1889). Sir Sidney Lee, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 401, note 2, is wrong in speaking of Watson's *Amyntas* as a Latin version of Tasso's pastoral. It is an independent work.

After writing the present article I observed that Upton in a note to the passage in his edition of the *Faerie Queene* (1758) remarks that Spenser might have taken this story "from the *Aminta* of Tasso." He must, of course, mean the Prologue. His suggestion, however, has been over-

Faerie Queene stanzas (ed. J. C. Smith, Oxford, 1909) and then the lines from Tasso's Prologue²:

It fortun'd, faire *Venus* hauing lost
Her little sonne, the winged god of love,
Who for some light displeasure, which him crost,
Was from her fled, as flit as ayerie Doue,
And left her blisfull bowre of ioy aboue,
(So from her often he had fled away,
When she for ought him sharply did reprove,
And wandred in the world in strange aray,
Disguiz'd in thousand shapes, that none might him
bewray.)

Him for to seeke, she left her heauenly hous,
The house of goodly formes and faire aspects,
Whence all the world deriues the glorious
Features of beautie and all shapes select,
With which high God his workmanship hath deckt;
And searched euery way, through which his wings
Had borne him, or his tract she mote detect:
She promist kisses sweet, and sweeter things
Vnto the man, that of hym tydings to her brings.

First she him sought in Court where most he vsed
Whylome to haunt, but there she found him not;
But many there she found, which sore accused
His falsehood, and with foule infamous blot
His cruel deedes and wicked wyles did spot:
Ladies and Lords she euery where mote heare
Complayning, how with his empoysned shot
Their wofull harts he wounded had whyleare,
And so had left them languishing twixt hope and feare.

She then the Citties sought from gate to gate,
And euery one did aske, did he him see;
And euery one her answerd, that too late
He had him seene and felt the crueltie
Of his sharpe darts and whot artillerie;
And euery one threw forth reproches rife
Of his mischieuous deedes, and said, That hee
Was the disturber of all ciuill life,
The enemy of peace, and author of all strife.

Then in the countrey she abroad him sought,
And in the rurall cottages inquired,
Where also many plaints to her were brought,
How he their heedlesse harts with loue had fyred,
And his false venom through their veines inspyred;
And eke the gentle shepherd swaynes, which sat
Keeping their fleecie flockes, as they were hyred,
She sweetly heard complaine, both how and what
Her sonne had to them doen; yet she did smile thereat.

looked in recent discussion and the matter seems to require, besides, consideration in detail, such as I have here attempted.

² The list of imitations of Moschus's idyl given by W. P. Mustard, *American Journal of Philology*, xxx, 277 f. (1909), does not include either this Prologue or Spenser's stanzas. Add still further to the list the *Amour fuitif* of Amadis Jamyn, the sixteenth century poet. My colleague, Prof. L. P. Shanks, pointed out this poem to me.

After this she continues her search in "the saluage woods and forrests wyde." She does not find Cupid but her nymphs discover Crysgone and her two babes, Belpheobe and Amoretta.

Let us turn now to the Italian: Love speaks the Prologue of the *Aminta*. To escape from Venus he has disguised himself as a shepherd. He goes on to say:

Io da lei son costretto di fuggire
E celarmi da lei, perch'ella vuole
Ch'io di me stesso e delle mie saette
Faccia a suo senno; e qual femmina, e quale
Vana ed ambiziosa, mi rispinge
Pur tra le corti, e tra corone e scettri,
E quivi vuol che impieghi ogni mia prova;
E solo al volgo de' ministri miei,
Miei minori fratelli, ella consente
L'albergar tra le selve, ed oprar l'armi
Ne' rozzi petti. Io che non son fanciullo,
Sebben ho volto fanciullesco ed atti,
Voglio dispor di me come a me piace;
Ch'a me fu, non a lei, concessa in sorte
La face onnipotente e l'arco d'oro.
Però, spesso celandomi, e fuggendo
L'imperio no, che in me non ha, ma i preghi
C'han forza, porti da importuna madre;
Ricovero ne' boschi e nelle case
Della gente minuta. Ella mi segue,
Dar promettendo a chi m'insegna a lei,
O dolci baci, o cosa altra più cara.

The contrast of pastoral life with the life of courts and cities is, of course, a commonplace of Renaissance literature, but the combination of this *motif* with that of Moschus's idyl is due to Tasso, and Spenser in the passage quoted above is merely following him. That he should express himself more diffusely than the Italian poet is just what we should expect. In discarding Tasso's conception that Venus wished to confine Cupid to courts, he was influenced, no doubt, by Moschus, who has nothing of this kind. In the main, however, it was Tasso's Prologue that suggested the course of Venus's search in the *Faerie Queene*, and in view of this fact, it is manifestly no accident that the lines of the English poet,

"She promist kisses sweet and sweeter things
Vnto the man that of hym tydings to her brings,"

stand closer to the last two lines of the Italian quoted above—of which, indeed, they are substantially a translation—than to the Greek

ἦν δ' ἀγάγῃς νυν,
οὐ γυνὸν τὸ φίλημα, τὶ δ' ὧ ξένη καὶ πλέον ἐξείς.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE.

University of Tennessee.

The Poetry of Victor Hugo, by PELHAM EDGAR and JOHN SQUAIR. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1911. xvii, 330 pp.

This new anthology of Hugo's poetry is the third which has appeared in America during the last five years. The selections, accompanied only by the briefest of general introductions and a glossary of names, are classified under the following headings, each division being preceded by a short introductory comment: Patriotic Poems (22 pages), Napoleon Poems (51), Narrative Poems (17), Nature Poems (45), Pictorial Poems (32), Meditative Poems and Lyrics (11), Visionary Poems (7), Poems on Death (54), Child Poems (13), Love Poems and Lyrics (21), Satiric Poems (5), Humanitarian Poems and Poems of Progress (27).

The editors give liberal space to the nature and philosophic poetry and preface it by a relatively long introduction, while of the Humanitarian Poems and Poems of Progress they say: "These poems demand the briefest comment. . . . These hopes may or may not be entirely consistent with his views of life nor in philosophical accord with facts; it is sufficient that they inspire him with poems that do lasting honor to his name." This seems short shrift for an important department of Hugo's work. Is it not precisely this large humanitarian trend of much of Hugo's work, now so completely in consonance with the thought and feeling of our time, that is helping to keep this poetry alive in spite of the prognosis of the critics? Again, Hugo's grotesque doctrine of metempsychosis can hardly be considered a permanent contribution to literature, and, considering their work merely in regard to the allotment of space, we believe that the editors take Hugo the philosopher and interpreter of nature much too seriously. There are given,

under various heads, the long poems, *L'Océan*, *Pleurs dans la nuit*, *L'Épopée du ver*, all of them too 'deep contemplative.' Hugo is here talking in the hierophantic strain and we believe it is a mistake to give up fifty-six pages to these three poems, none of them, considering that they are Hugo's, remarkable for form. Seventy-five pages more are given over to Patriotic Poems and to poems on Napoleon, here unhappily called Napoleon Poems; and we have thus already accounted for nearly one-half of the three hundred pages of text. We feel, therefore, that the editors have been less successful than either Canfield or Schinz in giving us representative selections of what is most valuable and permanent in Hugo's achievement.

Considering the purpose of the book, the method adopted in arranging the selections seems also somewhat inadvisable. Since material of this type is hardly suitable for rapid reading or linguistic drill, we assume that the volume is intended as a guide to the literary study of Hugo, and it would have been preferable to follow the chronological order, or else, as Professor Schinz has done, to divide Hugo's work into groups that would illustrate his achievement in the generally recognized fields of epic, lyric and philosophic poetry. The divisions themselves are arbitrary and over-numerous. *L'Expiation*, the finest satire in *Les Châtiments*, is included, not under Satiric Poems, but under Napoleon Poems; six selections are grouped under Narrative Poems, and four of these, *Les Djinns*, *Le Chasseur Noir*, *Les Reîtres*, and *La Chanson des doreurs de proues* are not in any proper sense narrative. The last two are technically lyrics and *Les Djinns* would have been better placed among Pictorial Poems. On the other hand *Le Mariage de Roland*, a narrative poem, if ever there was one, is printed under Pictorial Poems. To print, without particular explanation, *La Conscience* and *La Rose de l'Infante* with *Le Feu du ciel* is to overlook the immense difference in intention between *Les Orientales* and *La Légende des siècles*. From the standpoint of literary history, *La Légende* was certainly the most important of Hugo's later works, and, epic

or not, its avowed purpose was to interpret history. To split this poem up and distribute its parts among Pictorial Poems, Poems on Death, etc., was to make its interpretation impossible and to minimize the importance of what Banville called the Bible of all later poets.

It is strange that with their multiplicity of divisions the editors seem to have overlooked completely the autobiographical element, one of the most fruitful sources of Hugo's inspiration. Not only have they made no such division but they have also failed to include any one of the poems like *Mon Enfance*, *Souvenir d'enfance*, *Ce Siècle avait deux ans*, *Ce qui se passait aux Feuillantines*, or *A Propos d'Horace*, which, beside conveying much biographical information, illustrate so completely one of the most significant characteristics of the great romanticist. Under Narrative Poems we miss what has often been considered Hugo's most perfect achievement in this field, the little masterpiece, *Après la Bataille*, while *Pasteurs et troupeaux*, the classic example for illustrating Hugo's mythopœic quality, of which the editors make much, is also wanting. From the literary historical standpoint, again, the poems which made Hugo the god of 1830, 'époque fulgurante,' are with the exception of *Les Djinns*, scarcely represented at all. That nervous fear of the young lady reader which under the present system of publishing texts must haunt all editors, might well account for the omission of *La Chasse du burgrave* with its echoing *rimes riches*, but no such excuse can be offered for the absence of *Le Pas d'armes du Roi Jean*, whose fulness of color, rhyme, rhythm, tumult and medievalism made it the slogan of Hugo's *chef de clique*, Théophile Gautier. At least a few poems in characteristically romantic verse forms should have been included, and it is hard to be content with the absence of all reference to versification.

The introductory comments are usually judicious but occasionally need some qualification. Thus we read, p. 23: "Until about 1825, Hugo was, like all his Romantic contemporaries, a royalist and a catholic." It would be safer to say that until about 1825 Hugo was not a

romanticist at all. As late as February 1824 Hugo still speaks of *la frivole querelle des romantiques et des classiques* and significantly says to his readers: *Alors expliquez-vous; examinons la valeur de cette allégation (romantique); prouvez d'abord qu'elle est fondée; il vous restera ensuite à démontrer qu'elle n'est pas insignifiante. Mais on se garde fort aujourd'hui d'entamer, de ce côté, une discussion qui pourrait n'enfanter que le ridiculus mus; on veut laisser à ce mot romantique un certain vague fantastique et indéfinissable qui en redouble l'horreur.* Certainly this is not the language of a sympathizer, to say nothing of a devotee. His romantic contemporaries in 1825 would furthermore have to include Stendhal, Mérimée and de Vigny, no one of whom would fall under the editors' classification. On p. 136 it is said that Chateaubriand had something of the same breadth of vision as Chénier. But Chénier's poems, essentially cameos cut in verse, have little in common with the immense vistas of *Les Martyrs*, to which it is suggested that they are similar, and the advantage with regard to breadth of vision would surely lie with Chateaubriand. To say (p. 94) that Hugo's metaphors after 1840 "are no longer simply a resource of his art, but each metaphor embodies a genuine myth which the poet believes to be true not as mere symbol but as fact" is to be too painfully literal, and when the statement is followed by quotations like *L'urne Peut-être ayant l'infini pour couvercle* or *Ramper le scarabée effroyable du soir*, amounts to qualifying Hugo at best as an inspired madman.

When, however, we turn to the carefully printed text and the scholarly annotations we have nothing but praise. A careful reading has failed to disclose any departure from Hugo's text or any typographical error, and we have never taken up a first edition more carefully printed or proof-read. For their admirable work here we congratulate the editors most heartily.

A commendable restraint is shown in confining the notes to passages demanding explanation. Most of this exegetical matter is presented in the form of an encyclopedia of Hugo's

baffling proper names—no easy task. Occasionally an additional note might with advantage be added, particularly in the case of the poems on Napoleon, full of obscure contemporary references. Thus for instance in *A la Colonne*, p. 35,

*L'inégal paré de la ville
Fait encor trébucher leurs pas,*

the note on barricades might be more specific. *A la Colonne* was written early in October of 1830 and doubtless there were still streets that showed signs of the Revolution of July of the same year.—Toward the close of *L'Expiation* there is needed a note on Napoleon III, or an elucidation of particular passages; otherwise that poem will certainly baffle the student. Thus on p. 72, ll. 12-13,

*Ils ont pris de la paille au fond des casemates
Pour empailler ton aigle, ô vainqueur d'Iéna,*

the student should be told that the *paille* is Louis-Napoleon and the *casemate* the Fortress of Ham.—P. 37, ll. 26-28, is doubtless a reference to the occupation of France by the forces of the Coalition after 1815.—On p. 111, ll. 7-9,

*Visconti, vêtu de cuivre
D'un coup de poing à la guivre
Casse les dents,*

Hugo is hardly referring to Marco Visconti as the editors seem to think. It is more likely that the line was suggested by the Visconti arms, a coiled viper attacking a man, and the reference would be to Uberto Visconti who was supposed to have slain a dragon that was poisoning the Milanese citizens with his breath.¹ The note on Burrhus, p. 224, l. 22, tells us only that he was preceptor to Nero and died of poison. The context seems to indicate that Hugo had in mind the fact that the self-righteous Burrhus advised or at least acquiesced in the murder of Nero's mother, Agrippina.

Certain words not usually given in students' dictionaries call for explanation. So *argyraspide*, p. 224, member of a picked body of Alexander's troops armed with silver bucklers, whence the name. They were not, as Hugo

¹ See Litta, *Famiglie Celebri d'Italia*, Vol. x.

supposes, horsemen. Also *élytre* p. 134, the outer hard covering of an insect's wings, and *gypaète* p. 235, a vulture. On the half-dozen puzzling proper names of which the editors offer no explanation, I can add but little. There is a mountain *Falu* in Sweden which may have suggested the name but cannot be the *Mont Falu* of *Guitare*. The *Béit* of *Béit-Cifrésil* and *Abdallah-Béit* is doubtless the English Bey and *Abdallah* (servant of God) is a fairly common Mohammedan name occurring occasionally in the history of Cairo, but I have been unable to discover any name even approximating *Cifrésil* or any record of the building of a well such as is referred to in *La Rose de l'Infante*, p. 165, ll. 21-23. *Jérémadeth* in *Booz endormi*, p. 163, l. 21, occurring as it does in one of the most famous passages in all Hugo's poetry, deserves attention. The word does not occur in the Bible, nor is it to be found in the maps and guide-books of Palestine, so we may be constrained to accept the pun proposed by Grillet, *La Bible dans Victor Hugo* (Lyon, 1910), p. 226.—For *Sinnagog*, p. 157, see Berret, *Le Moyen Age dans la Légende des Siècles* (Paris, 1911), p. 30.—*Teb*, p. 111, and *Moganez*, p. 90, remain unsolved problems. In throwing light on the large number of other difficult and recondite allusions the editors have shown much patience and scholarship and deserve the thanks of all readers of Hugo.

CHRISTIAN GAUSS.

Princeton University.

The Tudor Drama. A history of English national drama to the retirement of Shakespeare. By C. F. TUCKER BROOKE. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1911. Pp. xii, 228.

It might be thought impossible at this time of day to write anything really fresh on this subject; but Mr. Brooke is entitled to the credit of this difficult achievement. It is not in the earlier and less developed part of the field that his success lies. Indeed, he remarks with a

touch of flippancy not altogether justified, and perhaps not intended, that "the origin of the modern European theatre in the services of the medieval church is matter of common knowledge, and the connection has perhaps received already more explanation than it requires" (p. 2). Mr. Brooke gives indeed a fair summary of the easily accessible sources of information as to the development of the drama from the Roman liturgy, but the subject stands in need of a good deal more investigation and explanation than it has yet received, and it will be surprising if in the course of a few years Mr. Brooke's account of the matter does not appear obviously defective. It is in the Elizabethan period that Mr. Brooke does his best work—partly, no doubt, because he is best acquainted with it, and partly because of the nature of the material with which he has to deal. At first sight this field might seem to have been most worked and to have attracted the most capable workers; but an opening was left for just such a volume of four or five hundred pages as Mr. Brooke has succeeded in writing. The distinguishing features of the Elizabethan drama are its astonishing vitality, variety, and complexity, and there is perhaps no better or more rational way of setting forth the facts than the method of Dr. Ward's *History of English Dramatic Literature*; and yet there is a danger that the student may come away from its perusal with the erroneous impression of an orderly chronological development—from liturgical drama to miracle plays, from miracles to moral plays, from moralities to interludes and histories, and so on to regular comedy and tragedy, the older types disappearing to make way for the new. Professor Schelling succeeds in giving the right impression of the synchronous development of very different forms of dramatic art in his *Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1642*, and Mr. Brooke's little volume is in this respect particularly effective, partly on account of its size, but mainly because of the skill with which he has woven together the diverse threads of influence and interest. For a right understanding of the subject, it is assuredly imperative that we should realize that

the older forms continued to exist alongside of the newer developments from them, and that the native drama was not superseded by plays copied from foreign or classical models. Our one detailed description of the way in which the miracle plays were acted is given by Archdeacon Rogers of Chester, who died in 1595; the Chester cycle, we know, was acted as late as 1575, and all five manuscripts date from the period 1591-1607. The moralities continued to be acted and to be published, in spite of the competition of the regular theatres, *The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality* being printed in 1602, after a performance before the Queen, apparently on February 4th, 1601. Mr. Brooke says:

‘The later moralities were usually performed by companies of four or five men and a boy,—the boy, of course, taking women’s parts. These troupes, once formed, continued themselves in unbroken sequence till the Restoration. There seems no doubt that the strolling players of the Commonwealth who roamed from village to village with their contraband dramatic wares, after the suppression of the theatres in 1642, were the lineal descendants, and the inheritors of many a piece of traditional clownage and stage business from those who in pre-Tudor times performed “The Castle of Perseverance.”’ (p. 58.)

The importance of the native element in *Ralph Roister Doister* is suitably emphasized by Mr. Brooke and he also draws attention to the combination of native realism, classical structure, and Italian romance in *Misogonus*, now convincingly ascribed by Professor Kittredge to Lawrence Johnson, who preceded M. A. at Christ’s College, Cambridge, in 1577. In the development of tragedy, Mr. Brooke rightly concludes that the most indispensable factor was the example of the Latin classic model, but he does not overlook the importance of the native and popular elements which contributed most materially to the vitality of the new form of art and prepared the way for its acceptance on the popular stage. His estimate of the relative importance and precise impact of the Senecan influence is excellent. He describes *The Spanish Tragedie* as “in many ways a

much truer representative of Seneca than confessed imitations like *Ferrex and Porrex*.” This seems to be putting the case strongly, but it is not an exaggeration in the sense intended. Kyd gave Senecan tragedy currency and carrying power. He adopted all the features suitable to the popular stage—the horrors and sensationalism, ghosts and furies, madmen and desperate villains, stirring rhetoric, poetical description, and philosophical reflection,—so far as he could, and so far as the public would tolerate them; and he added elements which gave this form of dramatic art a vitality which carried it throughout the great Elizabethan period, and indeed down to our own time. It may be questioned, however, whether the attainment of perfection in the Senecan style should not be given rather to *Titus Andronicus*. In general the two dramas belong to the same Senecan school; there are quotations from Seneca’s Latin text in *Titus Andronicus*, as there are in *The Spanish Tragedie*, and there are also passages imitated from Seneca. There are in both plays sensational horrors; but Kyd, as Mr. Boas has pointed out, “never glances at the grosser side of sexual relationships.” *Titus Andronicus* deals largely with this theme, and so does Seneca. The highly polished versification, the lively touches of natural description, and the weight and beauty of the reflective passages—the redeeming qualities of *Titus Andronicus* which are absent from Kyd’s work—are Senecan characteristics. In the passages imitated from Seneca in *Titus Andronicus*, the resemblance in tone and style is no less striking than the identity of content. Shakspeare, indeed, in his earlier plays has succeeded in catching the tone and manner of Seneca better than any previous imitator, and, it may be added, better than any imitator or translator since. As Churton Collins says, “in his earlier plays, where the influence of Seneca is more perceptible, Shakspeare’s style is often as near a counterpart in English of Seneca’s style in Latin as can be.”

Mr. Brooke is also justified in the remark, which at first appears an exaggeration, that *Romeo and Juliet* belongs fundamentally to the

progeny of Senecan tragedy (p. 221); and it may be added to the arguments he has adduced in support of this assertion that Shakspeare seems to have made in this play a conscious though slight concession to classical convention by the use of the chorus and the concentration of the action. Generally, in dealing with Shakspeare, Mr. Brooke experiences the same difficulty as previous historians of the Elizabethan drama; Shakspeare must stand with his fellows, and yet it seems impossible to portray him adequately without allowing him to crowd the others into the corners of the picture. Mr. Brooke has met the difficulty (it can hardly be said that he has solved it) by reducing Shakspeare a great deal below scale; but this is perhaps an inevitable defect, and one that can be very readily supplied elsewhere. Mention should be made of an interesting suggestion with respect to the much-discussed "War of the Theatres" and the purge which in *The Return from Parnassus* Shakspeare is said to have given to Ben Jonson. As this is a point of considerable interest, Mr. Brooke may well be allowed to speak for himself, after congratulations that so young a scholar has been able to deal adequately and freshly with an exceedingly complicated and apparently well worn subject:—

'I do not know that the reference to the purge in this Cambridge play has been definitely associated hitherto with the fact that "Hamlet" was acted, as the title-page of the first quarto (1603) tells us, not only in London, but "also in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and elsewhere." This announcement, together with the mention in the text itself of the travelling of the players, seems to point to a tour of the Globe Company before the end of 1601. Now the allusion to the "Purge" in the "Return from Parnassus" is of such a nature as to make it almost certain that the audience fully understood the reference. I believe that the passage was intended to recall some clearly expressed rebuke of Jonson in the text of "Hamlet" as recently acted in Cambridge. To be sure, as the latter play is preserved, it contains no distinct anti-Jonsonian stroke; but that fact is easily explained. It should be remembered that the earliest (1603) version of "Hamlet" contains only an excessively abbreviated mention of the theatri-

cal war; while the later quartos of 1604, etc., though certainly based on the true complete copy, purposely omit the twenty most significant lines concerning the "little eyases." The reason for the non-appearance of these lines in all editions except the 1623 Folio, is obviously the same as that which prevented Jonson from publishing his Apologetical Dialogue to "The Poetaster" in the 1602 edition of that play; namely, "The Restraint by Authority" of which Jonson expressly complains.

'When the collective editions of Jonson and Shakespeare were issued, in 1616 and 1623 respectively, there was no longer any necessity of suppressing general allusions to the long-past quarrel of the theatres. But there did exist the strongest reason why Shakespeare's editors should not have cared to give wanton offence to the most influential poet of the day, the generous supporter of their enterprise, by restoring excised and forgotten bits of personal ridicule. I believe, therefore, that the purge which made Jonson bewray his credit, the blow with which Shakespeare closed the War of the Theatres, was to be found in "Hamlet" as that play was presented in Cambridge, London, and elsewhere, in 1601-1602. I believe that it lay in the power of Shakespeare's literary executors, Heming and Condell, to preserve this passage, as they preserved the general quizzing of the little eyases, in their authoritative edition of the play. There can be no doubt, however, that in leaving to oblivion such a piece of transitory satire, which, even though not very unfriendly, may have been very humiliating to Jonson, the editors would have been faithfully observing the wish of the dead poet and the obvious proprieties of the situation. In view of the magnificent eulogy which Jonson was even at the moment contributing to their edition, the raking up of animosities of twenty years' standing would have been nothing short of unpardonable.'

J. W. CUNLIFFE.

University of Wisconsin.

GÜNTHER JACOBY, *Herder als Faust*. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1911.

JACOBY's book is an attempt to at up to the scene in Auerbach's Cell in Faust's outward and inward experiences were the experiences of Herder,—not the Herder ordinarily

portrayed in biography, but the image of him formed in the mind of young Goethe by personal contact and ardent hero-worship. The Faust of this part of Goethe's drama, he asserts, is not a composite picture, to which Herder might be said to have contributed certain features; he is Herder himself.

Scherer's identification of Herder as the model for Satyros produced a sensation, and aroused indignation in certain quarters. Jacoby's alleged discovery was announced by his publisher as sure to produce a sensation, but the author evidently expected that his bold thesis would be dismissed by Goethe scholars with little consideration, for in his introduction he urges that judgment should be suspended till all the evidence of his thick volume has been weighed. As though arguments which individually have no weight would, if sufficiently multiplied, acquire weight.

Goethe was the first literary historian to recognize his great indebtedness to Herder, and capable investigators have not disputed the fact, have differed only in their estimate of the extent of that influence. But it remained for Jacoby to raise Herder to the value of a real sun and reduce Goethe to that of a mere satellite in their relation to one another. If we should accept Jacoby's conclusions we should have to admit that the only way for external influence to enter young Goethe's intellectual life and be reflected in these particular scenes of *Faust* was through the medium of Herder. This would make it necessary for us to revise our opinion of Wolfgang's precocity and spiritual independence and look upon Herder as a sort of predigestor of all his mental pabulum at the time when he was just attaining his majority. It remains to be seen how many scholars will deem this representation of the remarkable relation worthy of a reply.

Jacoby brushes aside most of the results of others' investigations and attacks the problem of *Faust*'s prototype as though Goethe himself had given us valuable hints as to his own real character, and the investigations of distinguished Goethe specialists had been for the most part misguided. He disregards the

fact, to which Goethe himself more than once gave utterance, that some of our poet's creations are so typically human that their doubles might more than once be encountered in real life as well as found in the pages of history. Erich Schmidt's array of forerunners to Goethe's Faust is likewise ignored. The chronology of the various scenes is discarded, and we are asked to believe that "Erhabener Geist" in the "Wald und Höhle" scene refers to the Old Testament God of the "Prolog im Himmel," as though Faust himself had been present as an eavesdropper during that celestial scene. Jacoby asserts that the contents of the so-called "grosse Lücke" belonged to Goethe's original plot and the earliest passages written down. He thinks he has found the fundamental idea of the drama to be the "earthly passage of the divine soul through humanity," which is assigned as the reason why this soul never feels at home in man or on the earth, and why Faust makes his winning or losing of the wager with Mephistopheles hinge upon whether or not he shall ever say to any particular moment: "Prithee tarry, thou art so beautiful."

Since Herder is Faust, Goethe must needs be Wagner, and Jacoby almost hesitates to admit this.

His use of the word parallel is novel. The parallels he cites often give one the impression of sides of a triangle. The chief merit of his compilation is the evidence it affords of his zealous occupation with Herder's works.

One thing that makes the poet Goethe such an interesting study is the amount of general and specific information he gives us about himself and his poetic process. Most scholars consider these hints a valuable starting point for their investigations. Not so Jacoby. But his attempt to convert Goethe into a sort of dramatizing Eckermann is not likely to create a wide demand for his supplementary volume said to be already under way.

W. A. COOPER.

Stanford University.

Portraits of Dante, from Giotto to Raffael: a critical study, with a concise iconography, by RICHARD THAYER HOLBROOK. London: Medici Society; Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1911. xix, 263 pp.

This well documented work is sure to take the first rank as the authoritative treatise on one of the most interesting topics in iconography. For the first time we have within the covers of one book all the early portraits of Dante, many of them beautifully reproduced in color,—a feat that would have been impossible a few years ago. As Mr. J. A. Herbert, of the British Museum, says, in his recent work on "*Illuminated manuscripts*," there are few more absolute despots than an established iconography, and we may add that there is no doubt as to what the phrase "a Dantesque profile" means to the average reader. The task of tracing back to some one or more originals the variant forms of any well known pictorial presentment is a most fascinating one, and Dr. Holbrook has handled his problems well,—although his style is perhaps too disputatious for any but those who are keenly interested in some of the minutiae of the case. The opinions of all who have previously dealt with the questions involved are passed in review, weighed and revalued, and the author does not hesitate to differ with his predecessors in the field, to give new opinions and to suggest new relations between allied portraits.

He begins with a consideration of the documentary value of old portraits, and then takes up the written sources, such as the romancing Boccaccio, the more sober Leonardo Bruni, and the chronicler Villani. He shows up the unscientific handling of Dante's bones at the time of their exhumation in 1865.

We are glad to see the author characterize the Report of Milanese and Passerini, naming the miniature in the Riccardian ms. 1040 as the most authentic portrait extant, as among the most paradoxical productions in the history of Dante's posthumous fortunes. The miniature in the Palatine ms. 320 the author believes was not only derived from the Bargello portrait, but was probably the original from which the unknown sculptor of

the Naples bust derived his conception of Dante's features. This seems to me the weakest part of the iconographic pedigree which Dr. Holbrook prints on page 72. An unfortunate feature of that attempt to reduce to the form of a genealogical tree the relations of these various portraits to one another is that from the diagram alone it would look as if the Torrigiani mask and the Riccardi miniature were considered as offshoots of somewhat the same period. No sire ever had sons of such unequal age! The author himself grants that there are probably several centuries between these two.

It is with satisfaction that we see Faltoni's sketch of the Bargello fresco before restoration given the credit due it. While Kraus attached considerable importance to it, it has had nothing like the fame which the Kirkup sketch enjoyed through the Arundel Society facsimile and numerous other less faithful reproductions. As for the Marini *rifacimento*, that has been copied so assiduously in popular editions of the *Divina Commedia* and latterly on every form of Florentine souvenir that it has been almost indelibly stamped on the public mind as the authenticated portrait of the youthful Dante.

The author does the present writer the honor to quote his characterization of the original of Morghen's engraved portrait of Dante as "long since lost" in both the heading and body of chapter XIX and then proceeds to try to prove that he has found the original Tofanelli painting in the art gallery of his alma mater, Yale University. But in the last footnote to this chapter, Dr. Holbrook says that he now feels that his assertions concerning the Yale Dante are too positive,—in which we agree with him. The fact that the book was printed in England and that the corrections had piled up to a very considerable extent during the printing can be considered sufficient reasons for some of the addenda and corrigenda appearing in the various parts of the book.

In his Appendix II, on the life and character of Seymour Kirkup and on his credibility as a witness, Dr. Holbrook quotes from my "*Dante in America*" to the effect that Miss Wilde had often heard her father describe Kirkup as a "clever but rather unscrupulous man, artistic and literary, but shallowly so" and adds that

this is the harshest of all opinions that he has found concerning him. If Dr. Holbrook will reread my preface he will find that Miss Wilde was the granddaughter and not the daughter of Richard Henry Wilde and so, of course, the estimate of Kirkup was more of a family tradition than a direct quotation from the collaborator with Kirkup himself. I may add that in my original manuscript, written fifteen years ago, after several interviews with my informant, the statement was still stronger and that it was toned down to the published form at the suggestion of Charles Eliot Norton, who did me the favor of going over this *opusculum juventutis*. The naïve reference to "another American of greater fame," which follows in Dr. Holbrook's note, leaves it uncertain whether he is paying Richard Henry Wilde, Miss Wilde or myself the compliment of comparison with Nathaniel Hawthorne.

THEODORE W. KOCH.

University of Michigan.

HENRI LAVEDAN, *Le Duel*, edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by STEPHEN H. BUSH. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1911. 16mo., x + 218 pp.

It hardly needs demonstration that this *drame passionnel*, while pointing a moral, can have but a limited sphere of usefulness in the American classroom. One has only to read the second scene of the first act, with its description of the vices of a *dégénéré héréditaire* and its exposition of the doctrine of *le droit à l'amour*, to perceive that it would be inadvisable to put the book in the hands of any but mature students, and, at that, only in connection with some special course on the modern French drama. Even from this point of view, the value of *Le Duel* is open to some question. As a modern adaptation of the classic ideal of a *crise psychologique*, this play is probably one of the best among those relatively unobjectionable from the American point of view; but it may fairly be doubted whether, in spite of its initial vogue, it will have other than a comparatively ephemeral career. The miscreant doctor's crude and brutal

cynicism, unrelieved by wit or *finesse*, makes one of the protagonists anything but an attractive character, while there is a fundamental *vice de construction* in the *dénouement*, a *deus-ex-machina* cutting of the knot that leaves the human problem as unsolved as before. As in the duel of the comic papers, the bystanders suffer the chief damage, while the real point at issue remains untouched.

The introduction to the present edition is well-written, and more readable than is often the case with similar compositions. There is, perhaps, a disproportionate space given up to the analysis of another of Lavedan's plays—the connection with *Le Duel* not being clear—and one could have wished for some other conclusion than a mere chronological recapitulation of his works; but the introductory chapter will, on the whole, invite the attention of the student and leave him with a fair idea of Lavedan's literary activities.

TEXT.—Comparison with the French original¹ shows that the text has been reproduced without abridgement or alteration, even in the case of palpable errors; cf. 7, 3, *interwiever*; 68, 4, *et* for *en* (see the second and fourth lines following); 108, 10, *Mai si!*; 123, 6 (and vocabulary, s. v. *part*), *De quel part*.² The punctuation of the French edition is followed, even to preserving certain oddities of doubtful status, and some evi-

¹ Paris: Ollendorff, 1907, 17ème Edition.

² These typographical errors are not in the original: 6, 13; 42, 13 and 136, 10, *la* for *le*.—116, 13, *commence*: read *commerce*.—151, 8, insert *deux* after *tous*.—157, 14, *elle*: read *celle*.—Page 11, in the sentence, *Il a reconquis . . . assez de . . . volonté pour qu'il ne soit très dangereux de le tenir enfermé . . .* either *ne* should be omitted, which is strictly the correct idiom, or *pas* should be inserted after *soit*, as in the original, in which construction *assez* has acquired by "contamination" somewhat the value of *trop*. Page 172, note 29, 10, *qu'* has been omitted before *on*. Page 175, note 91, 9, in the text *Monsieur* has no capital. In the vocabulary, "affair" (English) and *Heuri* (French) are misspelled; an accent is *de trop* on *devancer*, and missing on *présenter*, *sortilège*, *témoigner*; the designation "f." after *prévoir* should be omitted, and the punctuation of "m: f;" after *prisonnier* made to conform with the system employed elsewhere; *sauvegarde* should not be hyphenated, while *peut-être* should. Why dignify *Mesdames* with a capital if not *messieurs*? Moreover neither word occurs in the text.

dent mistakes.³ A curious departure from the original, however, is the frequent use of four *points suspensifs*, usually at the end of a sentence, but often in the middle (e. g., 28, 21; 91, 4). French usage allows but three, even when one of them is properly the period that closes the sentence.

NOTES.⁴—In the editing of a text for class use, the delicate question as to what passages call for explanation in the notes is one on which probably no two editors would entirely agree. From the point of view, however, of the degree of proficiency that could fairly be expected of the classes that will read *Le Duel*, some of the notes in the book under consideration are obviously too elementary; for example: 8, 2, *Comment va-t-il?* "How is he?"—13, 16, "*le* is commonly thus used to refer back to some word or phrase."—98, 2, *qu'éprouve mon mari*; the student should by this time be beyond the stage where such a simple case of this inversion causes him any "discomfort."

On the other hand, many allusions and expres-

³ In one case at least (96, 10), missing punctuation has been supplied, a precedent that might well have been followed elsewhere, as: a comma is required after *repos*, 25, 9; *mère*, 110, 4; *dme* and *toi*, 112, 11,—an interrogation mark after *Qui*, 93, 8, and *quoi*, 120, 3. The capital letter is out of place, 29, 1 and 113, 7 (cf. 91, 6); 114, 18; 119, 10. One is tempted to read *qu'est-ce qui* 48, 1. Missing accents and errors of punctuation, original with the American edition, are numerous. Cf. 20, 2 (the semi-colon should be a comma), 75, 1, *desir* (the more common accented form is used everywhere else); page 79, 11th line of the stage directions; 104, 1; 106, 9; 114, 1; 142, 1; 144, 9. In this connection, it must be admitted that, as a piece of book-making, the present volume is decidedly below the standard to which this house has accustomed us. Spacing, alignment and folding are defective, and imperfect type abounds (41, 12; 44, 18; 162, 7). The omission of the period in stage directions would be less disconcerting if it were more uniform (cf. pages 166, 168, 169).

⁴ Apropos of notes in general, the question is pertinent whether it is not more rational to indicate by some means, in the text itself, the passages that are explained in the notes. The latter having been devised to aid the student, it would seem but consistent to inform him at once when this aid is to be had, and thus save needless labor where a note exists, or fruitless looking for one that does not. (Cf. pages 3-22 of *Le Cid* as published by the same house.)

sions that would certainly not be clear to most students are passed over without mention, such as: 6, 6, *on ne visite pas*; this means here specifically: "This establishment is not open to the public."—12, 6, *qu'on a l'air d'y tenir*, "as one likes to make out."—12, 16, *Ce sont des regrets en moins, allez!—Ou en plus*. "Well, just so much the less to regret." "Or so much the more."—Page 26, stage directions, line 6, *donner le bras à qq'un* has come, by a peculiar transfer, to mean "take some one's arm," which is evidently the sense called for in the case of the crippled bishop.—69, 14, *Je n'en sais rien!* "I am not so sure."—122, 2, *il ne reçoit pas* is a social formula, equivalent to our "he begs to be excused."—37, 9, *péché immortel*; 41, 10, *violet, rouge*; 63, 15, *pêche miraculeuse* (vocabulary, "miraculous fishing"); 115, 11, *mâr pour Notre-Dame*; 158, 18, *livre d'heures*: these allusions would probably be missed by most students. The list might be considerably prolonged.

In the proper translation of any dialogue, a very real difficulty lies hidden in the frequently recurring adverbial expressions, interjections and incomplete phrases, which, simple enough in appearance, are by no means always easy to interpret, and "a literal translation of which . . . is ruinous to the sense" (note 16, 12). A few of those occurring in the present text are explained in notes or vocabulary, but the majority have been left unnoticed, as, for example: 14, 2 and 23, 8, *En attendant*, "Be that as it may."—15, 11, *Vous trouvez?* (vocabulary, "find"), "Do you really think so?" (cf. 52, 10).—17, 13, *Parfaitement!* (vocabulary, "perfectly"), "Most certainly!" and 50, 2, "Just so."—29, 13, *et encore*, "and even then."—56, 5, *Décidément!* "Well, I declare!"—81, 11, *Puisque je vous avais dit . . .*, "But I told you . . ."—119, 10, *hier encore, tiens!* "why even yesterday."

Even in the notes that are given, many statements are incorrect or misleading; among others, the following: 19, 6. *Attendre*, in the sense of "expect," is not "rare" with a personal object.—21, 3. *Il ne fallait pas tant me le prouver* means, "You should not have proved it to me so often." The meaning given, "It did not take so much," would have required *pour* before the infinitive.—21, 5. This use of the interrogation point is not,

as the note implies, general in French typography, but is a *tic* of M. Lavedan or of his printer, as will be seen from the following examples: 132, 9, *Vous? Une duchesse! millionnaire?* 149, 7, *Emmenez-moi! Ayez pitié?* 153, 1, *Attendez? Pas encore? Au moins restez? Ne me quittez pas? Assistez à cet entretien?*⁵—29, 10. There is no "delightful confusion," but only modest deprecation in the Bishop's remarks, which should be translated: "Why, I couldn't get over my surprise! You get an exaggerated idea of a thing beforehand, but when it really comes . . ."—30, 7. The correct reference is Luke, II, 29.—81, 1. *ce tantôt* is a popular expression meaning "this afternoon."—91, 9. *monsieur a raison*. The Duchess is speaking to the *abbé*, as is shown by the expression *chez vous*. The third person in direct address being used only toward those of superior rank, it would be impossible in the mouth of a duchess, addressing the doctor of an insane asylum. The correct translation here is: "This gentleman is right."—97, 20. This expression should be noted where it is first met with, 83, 20.—102, 11. The term *mea culpa* refers, not to the words, but to the gesture that habitually accompanies them, made by striking the breast with the tips of the fingers brought together. (Cf. the rest of the sentence: *dont vous vous frappez la poitrine, au lieu d'en arracher l'amour, l'y enfoncent, à coups de marteau!*)—119, 10. The translation suggested does not fit the context. The correct version has been given above in another connection.—125, 18. *Bien le respect* is distinctly a servant's form of leave-taking and should be translated as such. The French idiom corresponding to "with all due respect" is *sauf votre respect*.—149, 11. *dans le temps* means "in olden times." "In its day" is *en son temps*. The connection with note 13, 16 ("le is commonly thus used to refer back to some word or phrase") is not clear.

VOCABULARY.—The need of a vocabulary for the text in hand is not obvious. Students mature

⁵ In some instances, this device is anomalous in the extreme, as, for example, in the case of a reply to a question (43, 3), or where the speaker expressly says: "*Je ne te demande pas . . .*" (90, 7). Cf. also 140, 2: *Mon frère ne s'est pas privé de remuer exprès, de sa main savante, cette boue endormie de ma jeunesse?*

enough to read with profit a problem play of this character should not require to be told that *au* = *à + le* and *du* = *de + le*, that *crois* is from *croire* and *ceux* from *celui*, nor that *absence*, *absolution*, *accent* mean the same in French as in English. Moreover, the student should be encouraged, as early as possible, to use a dictionary—preferably an all-French dictionary at this stage of his work—both for the valuable mental exercise of selecting the appropriate definition, and in order to grasp, for each new word, the essential rather than some special meaning.⁶ For *Le Duel*, a vocabulary was unnecessary, if not indeed inadvisable; ampler notes covering the more difficult expressions would have been sufficient.

The present vocabulary gives evidence of having been compiled with a meticulousness that deserved to be better employed.⁷ Such familiar variants as *j'*, *l'*, *l'on*, are painstakingly noted, as well as most of the irregular verb-forms contained in the text, including the well-known parts of *aller*, *devoir*, *falloir*, etc. Notes explaining proper names and idioms are reproduced, often *in toto*, in the vocabulary, the idioms sometimes under both the principal component words. (E. g., *non plus*; *pourquoi faire?*)⁸ An unfortunate habit is that of citing an idiom, not in its most general form, but in the particular one that occurs in the text. (Cf. *cas*,

⁶ A striking example of this latter point is the word *aboutir*, defined in the vocabulary of *Le Duel* as "to come to the point." While this definition happens to fit the context (52, 21), it would be unfortunate for the student to get the impression that it represents the true meaning of the word. Cf. also *trouble* and *troubler*, defined as "trouble."

⁷ The following omissions have, however, been noted, besides those mentioned elsewhere in this article: *ça!*, *Christ*, *confidence*, *contigu*, *efficace*, *élite*, *frissonner*, *que* = "why?" (42, 9), *qui* = "what?" (70, 7), *scrupuleux*, *te*, *tenez!*, *à travers*; the idioms, *par calcul*, *à plaisir*, *de trop*; the adjectives, *affolant*, *chinois*, *courant*, *croyant*, *idéal*, *mourant*, *saint*, *trouble*, *vivant*. Also, the following definitions should be added to those given: *aspirer*, draw in, quaff (75, 11 vs. *aspirer à*, 96, 3); *condition*, social position; *droit*, erect, stiff; *être*, to go; *faute*, sin, mistake; *perdre*, ruin, waste; *poignée*, handful; *regretter*, miss, long for; *rendre*, make; *suite*, sequel; the substantial use of *monsieur*, *petit*; the transitive value of *désespérer*, and the intransitive meaning of *ressusciter*.

⁸ The device of thus translating an idiom in every place where it may reasonably be looked for is, doubtless, often a time-saver for the student, but surely it is supererogatory in such cases as *billet de banque* and *cabinet de travail*.

. . . *le—qu'en font les hommes.*) The consequence is such inaccuracies as "*s'y attendre*, to expect," "*s'en réjouir*, to rejoice." For the same reason, the special definitions given for *vous en savez plus long*, *leur obligé*, *grande ouverte* do not properly cover respectively *en sait plus long* (60, 18), *ton obligée* (57, 1), *grands ouverts* (164, 11).⁹

A more serious defect is the general lack of system in the construction of the vocabulary. Such items as *Légion d'honneur*, *Saint-Germain*, *Sainte-Marie-des-Marteaux* belonged more properly in the notes, where similar explanations are numerous. In some cases, two different functions of a word are grouped indiscriminately, as *leur*, personal and possessive pronoun. This is particularly the case with the adjectival and substantival uses of the same word. In some cases, they are printed separately (*intérieur*); in others, they are indicated by the designation *m. adj.* (*savant*), or *m., f., adj.* (*ennemi*), or by such a device as "*dévo*t, devout, devout person," "*isolé*, isolated (man)"; in other instances, again, this distinction is ignored entirely (*mort*, 148, 7; 162, 14, —*détaché*, 115, 16; 165, 10), which would probably have been the better plan in nearly every case. We find *j'* and *l'*, as above mentioned, but not *m'*, *s'*, *t'*; *nos*, but not *vos*; the feminine of *client*, *croquant*, *odieux*, but not of *présent*, *payant*, *orgueilleux*, etc., although the latter are met with in the text. *Nôtre* comes before *notre*, but *vôtre* after *votre*. We are told the plural of *chapeau*, which does not occur in the play, but not that of *vitrail*, which does. The pronominal use of some verbs is given; it is omitted with others where it is essential (*absenter*, *efforce*r, *méfier*, *méprendre*, *obstiner*), or where it has a peculiar value (*abreuer*, *complaire*, *tordre*, etc.). *Auteuil* is given in the notes alone, *Saint-Germain* in the vocabulary, *Grenelle* in both, and *Notre-Dame* in neither.

The definitions themselves are in a large number of cases inadequate or incorrect. In general, only one meaning is given for each word, and in nearly every case it is the English homonym where one exists. This results not only in conveying a false impression of the style (cf. *pulsa-*

tions, "pulsations" vs. "beats," 35, 8; *contraindre*, "constrain" vs. "force," 53, 13), but in definitions unsuited to the context, as, for example, to "address" a glance (*passim*), to "commit" a lie (70, 7), a mistake (96, 10). This is the more surprising as the editor himself has sounded a warning note (see n. 84, 3) as to "the numerous French words different in meaning from the allied or derived English word."

The definitions which, while correct in themselves, do not meet the text, are too numerous to be cited here.¹⁰ The student who uses the vocabulary conscientiously will be rewarded with such combinations as these: 9, 16, "vile and hasty enjoyments."—11, 4, "keep him enclosed in this asylum."—12, 4, "I am devoted to misfortune."—28, 9, "I have a bad head" (I am pigheaded).—37, 15, "pass the water again" (cross the seas once more, go back overseas).—47, 1, The doctor is "laborious."—67, 17, "Our two sadnesses behave and correspond."—Page 136, The bishop motions to the servant that he can "introduce" the *abbé* . . . "The *abbé* is introduced."

Several definitions could well have been rendered more precise: *administrer*, to administer the sacrament to; (*sœur*) *converse*, lay sister; *dizaine*, decade (of Aves); *fondation*, endowed institution; *œuvre*, charity (85, 13, vs. 145, 11); *patronage*, Children's Aid Society; *retraite*, *faire une* —, make a (religious) retreat. Others, again, contain shortcuts liable to mislead the student, e. g.: *avoir*, "to be the matter with" (25, 6); *devenir*, "to become of" (22, 14); *entourer*, "to put around" (30, 14). It might be mentioned also that neither notes nor vocabulary throw any light on the value of such peculiar plurals as: *approches*, 83, 12; *convoitises*, 42, 8; *courages*, 149, 7, and 163, 14; *impatiences*, 18, 6; *pitiés*, 164, 2; *sollicitudes*, 71, 10.

Of the erroneous definitions, which are numerous, the following are among the most important:

¹⁰ Some of the more important of these cases are: *client*, patient (110, 13, cf. 54, 12); *confusion*, embarrassment (126, 5); *déception*, disappointment (13, 8); *endormir*, anaesthetize (29, 9); *exempt*, lacking in (47, 20); *faissable*, why not "feasible"? (54, 16); *galerie*, hall; *impas-sible*, impassive (page 153, last line); *instant* is oftener the equivalent of the English "moment" (cf. 24, 10; 135, 1; 154, 4).

⁹ Cf. in this connection: "*convers*, *sœur* —"; "*jour*, . . . huit —, quinze —"; "*mien*, . . . les —"; "*ouvert*, . . . grande —"; "*rameau*, . . . les —" (*Rameaux*).

actuellement, "actually."—*affût*. The idiom à l'affût de is derived, not from "gun carriage," but from the sense of "poste derrière un arbre pour guetter" (Dict. Gén.).—*aise*. In the expression *j'en suis bien aise*, we have the adj., not the subst.—*armoire-bibliothèque*, "secretary" (book-case).—*d'autant que*, "inasmuch as" (the more so as, 52, 4).—*avant*, "in front of." Its use in this sense has not been found in the text.—*bahut*, "chest" (cabinet, p. 79; cf. "à deux corps").—*dévo*t, "devout." "Pious" renders better the hypocritical shading of this word in French.—*dispensaire*, "dispensary" (dispensary).—*enfin que*, "in order that" (96, 13, anyhow, that . . . ; 125, 15, in short, that . . . *Afin que* does not occur in the text.)—*Grandeur*, "Grandeur (title)." A bishop is addressed as "Your Grace," or in England, "My Lord" or "Your Lordship."—*impérieux*, "imperious" (imperative: *un impérieux devoir*, 88, 6).—*infranchissable*, "impassable" (that cannot be bridged or crossed: *d'infranchissables distances*, 115, 2).—*intérieur* is masc.—*meuble*, "furniture" (piece of furniture; cf. the plural, 79, 3).—*momentanément*, "momentarily" (temporarily, 10, 17).—*monseigneur*, "My Lord (title given to bishop)." This expression is not used in America; cf. *Grandeur*, *supra*.—*nunc dimittis*. The verb is not imperative.—*personne*, "f., person, nobody," is masc. in the latter sense.—*pieux*, "pious" (religious; cf. *dévo*t, *supra*).—*pleur*, "f., tear" (masc., weeping; pl., tears).—*reproche* is masc.—"*saute*, f., health" is evidently an erroneous repetition of *santé*.—*songeux*. The masc. is *songeur*.—"*stupéfaire*, to stupefy," does not exist except in the past participle.—*tantôt*, "just now" (a short while ago; vs. *tout à l'heure*).—*en travers de*, "through" (across, blocking, 93, 1).

It hardly needs to be said, in conclusion, that a thorough revision of this text-book is imperative before it can be used with satisfaction. The vocabulary should be omitted altogether, for the reasons stated above. It will then remain to be seen whether, upon trial in the class room, *Le Duel* will be found to have any lasting value, either intrinsically or as representing some phase in the progress of French drama in the early twentieth century.

FREDERICK A. BLOSSOM.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Materials for the Study of the English Drama (excluding Shakespeare). A Selected List of Books in The Newberry Library. The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois. 8vo., vii, 89. 50 cents.

As the title-page indicates, this admirable little bibliography is intended primarily for the convenience of students of the English Drama using the Newberry Library, but its excellence ensures it a usefulness far larger than its compiler anticipated for it. The fact that this is a selected list of works for the student of the drama is the key to its value. There are many more inclusive bibliographies dealing with the English Drama, or with particular periods or authors, but there is no list known to the reviewer covering practically the whole field (except Shakespeare) at once so full, so compact, and compiled with so much judgment and understanding as to what books are really helpful to the student. Many will regret that Shakespeare has not been included, and that only a few authors of the so-called "poetic" drama have been entered. We are, however, led to hope for a Shakespeare list at no very distant day, and probably the contention that present-day interest is centered chiefly in the "acted" drama is correct. Certainly within its sphere and within its scope the list is excellent.

The works included are classified under the following heads: Bibliography; Periodicals, Societies, and Associations; History, Theory, and Criticism; Biography, General and Collective; Biography and Criticism, Individual; Dramas and Plays, Collected Works and Editions of Single Plays by Individual Authors, including Anonymous Dramas; History of the Stage and Theatre in the United States; American Dramatists, Collected Works and Editions of Single Plays, Anonymous Dramas. A full index is provided.

Experience in a great Library gives an excellent training for work of this kind, and one can readily believe that this convenient List includes only those works that have been shown to be of most use to the largest number of persons engaged in the study of the English Drama.

This is Number 1 of the "Publications of the

Newberry Library"; if this is an indication of the quality of future numbers, one may predict for them a grateful reception.

ARTHUR ADAMS.

Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

CORRESPONDENCE

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON WARD'S *History of English Dramatic Literature*

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Ward's *History of English Dramatic Literature* remains in many respects such a useful reference book for students of the drama that it seems worth while to point out two slight errors for the sake of a possible third edition.

In summarizing Heywood's *Four P's* (2d ed., Vol. I, p. 245) Mr. Ward states that "The competition consists in the telling of two stories by the Palmer and the Pardoner, and the outbidding of their lies circumstantial by a monstrously extravagant assertion on the part of the 'Poticary.'" The fact is that the 'Poticary' and the Pardoner tell the tales, while the Palmer, whose extensive travels add point to the statement, easily proves himself the greatest liar of the three by remarking that in the whole course of his journeyings he has never seen a woman out of patience.

In the discussion of Redford's morality, *Wyt and Science* (op. cit., pp. 127, 128) the statement is made that "There is an amusing scene, in which *Ignorance* is put through a spelling-lesson by *Idlenes*, the word which he is set to spell being *England*." The scene is an amusing one, but the word which the fool is set to spell is not *England*, but his own name, spelled *Ignorance*. Since at that time the final *e* of *Ignorance* was pronounced, *Idlenes* has five syllables to teach the fool on his "thummes." If the lesson had been *England*, which has only two syllables, the humorous situation could not have been so cleverly sustained for forty-five lines. It is easy to see how the error was made, for *Idlenes* tries to teach *Ignorance* the first syllable, *Ing*, of his name, by a reference to the same syllable in *England*.

MARGRETTA MARTIN.

Mount Holyoke College.

BEOWULF 168-9

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The two lines:

*No he þone ȝifstol ȝretan moste,
Maþðum for metode, ne his myne wisse*

have been much discussed. It will not be necessary for me to sum up anew the conflict of opinions; that has been done admirably by Schücking, p. 100 of his edition.

In the O. E. Bede, however, there is a curiously parallel expression which no one—to the best of my belief—has noted. Bede is telling of the man who was (physically) tormented by evil spirits and of his miraculous cure. In Miller's ed., p. 186, 18-20, we read: "*Ond siððan of þære tide þa awyrgeðan gastas hine mid nænige ege ne mid geswencnisse ȝretan dorston.*" The Latin original reads: "neque aliquid ex eo tempore nocturni timoris aut uexationis ab antiquo hoste pertulit." The O. E. rendering, it will be seen, is free; still, the 'thought' of "aliquid timoris aut uexationis pertulit" is fairly conveyed by "mid nænige ege ne mid geswencnisse ȝretan."

As a whole, the Bede passage proves that *ȝretan* was not restricted to the sense of the modern 'greet,' but might be used in *malam partem* = to approach with unfriendly intent.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

SLANG: to get cold feet

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The slang phrase, "to get cold feet," which has become current in the sense of 'to recede from a difficult position, or to lose one's nerve,' does not appear in English in former days. No reference to it can be found in the *Oxford Dictionary*, or in the reprinted edition of Grose's *Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue*, 1795. Farmer and Henley in their seven-volume work, *Slang and its Analogues*, do not give it. Even the works treating of American slang, including the works of Bartlett, Maitland, Tanner and Clapin, make no reference to it. The expression occurs, however, in the most popular novel by the Low German writer, Fritz Reuter. In his *Stromtid* ('Years of Roving'), part II, chapter 22, he describes a card-party. One of the players, who was in bad luck, seeking an excuse to quit the game, rose up and said that he had got cold feet (*hei hadd kolde Fäut*

kregen). The novel referred to was first published in 1862. Is it likely that in this pretext to break off the game an indication of the Dutch or German origin of the slang use of the expression is given?

J. F. L. RASCHEN.

Lafayette College.

Slick-free OR *stick-free*?

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In Shirley's *The Young Admiral* (Gifford's ed., pp. 128-160), the phrase "*Slick and shot free*" occurs five times, and the phrases "*free from slick and shot*" and "*slick free*" once each. Gifford, evidently puzzled by the expression, invents this explanation: "Whether *slick* was a cant phrase for a sword (or *steel*), from its smooth and polished appearance, I know not; wherever the word is used, as here, in combination with *shot*, it evidently bears a meaning of this kind." He also states, somewhat vaguely, that "the expression . . . is found in other writers of Shirley's time." Nares' *Glossary* (ed. Halliwell and Wright) gives the word *slick-free*, defining it as "impervious to a sword or other slick weapon," and adds that the word occurs in Holbyand. An examination of the quarto edition of *The Young Admiral* (1637) shows that at least three times the word is printed *stick* instead of *slick*. Gifford, thinking this a misprint, silently changed the reading. But is it not more than probable that *stick-free* is the form that Shirley wrote? It has the merit of being intelligible, while *slick-free*, in spite of Gifford's effort to explain it, is meaningless. Compare, for example, the German *stichfrei*,—invulnerable. Moreover, Burton (*Anatomy of Melancholy*), in the chapter "Of Witches and Magicians" (part I, sect. II, mem. i, subsection iii, or vol. I, p. 233 of Shilleto's edition), has this passage: "They (*i. e.* witches) can make stick frees, such as shall endure a rapier's point, musket shot, and never be wounded." The passage is especially pertinent, because Burton has in mind the same kind of witchcraft and charms that Shirley is ridiculing in the scenes referred to.

ALFRED C. POTTER.

Harvard College Library.

BRIEF MENTION

Shakespearian Punctuation. By Percy Simpson (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911). This book should have the effect of diverting a share of attention from attempts at emendations of the text to a better appreciation of the meaning of its original punctuation. More important than many a verbal change is the correct punctuation of, for example, the opening lines of the 84th sonnet:

"Who is it that says most which can say more
Than this rich praise that you alone are you"

Here a mark of interrogation has erroneously become fixed after "which" (here a relative pronoun) and at the end of the second line (p. 13). Mr. Simpson has made a valuable contribution to the study of Shakespeare by considering the system of punctuation of the First Folio and of the first edition of the sonnets as a coherent whole. The old system is thus acquitted of the charge of being the haphazard result of the printers' ignorance. But more than this, the system, "on the whole sound and reasonable," is found to be worthy of 'poetic study,' because it reveals not only the sense of many a passage that has been distorted by modern points, but also the rhythm and cadence of the text, and features of the master's style. To illustrate the last statement, it is a valid induction that shows a feature of Shakespeare's style and rhythm to lurk in an avoidance of monotony "by putting an adjective with the second pair" of a double antithesis. Thus, *Macbeth* I, ii, 57 is correctly printed in the First Folio:

"Point against point, rebellious arm 'gainst arm"

The old system of punctuation, from Spenser to Milton, is, of course, to a very considerable extent rhythmic, and therefore free, in contrast to the modern logical and grammatical system with its rigid rules and stubborn fashions. Mr. Simpson has arranged his material under the 'points' of punctuation. A cross-classification, under the logical categories, would perhaps have served his purpose better. The book is incomplete in range of matter and inconclusive in method of examination; but it must show the importance of studying the rhythmic and rhetorical principles underlying this neglected system of punctuation. The classical scholar has been trained in the observation of a long tradition of rhythmic prose (for a bibliography of the subject see *Am. Journal of Phil.*, xxv, 454, note), and he therefore comes to the reading of an author like Robert Greene (see Professor K. F. Smith, *id.*, xxxii, 346) with the conviction that the 'old fashioned' punctuation served with consistency a rhetoric

and artistic purpose. In respect of this feature, therefore, there is need of sound doctrine in the appreciative reading of such a text as, for example, M. Feuillerat's recent *Arcadia*. Mr. Simpson has made a good beginning in the subject.

Sieben spanische dramatische Eklogen, mit einer Einleitung über die Anfänge des spanischen Dramas, Anmerkungen und Glossar, herausgegeben von Dr. Eugen Kohler. Dresden, 1911 (*Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur*, Band 27). 4to., xi + 365 pp. The introduction is the most valuable part of this book. It discusses critically and at considerable length Spain's three pioneer dramatists, or authors of dialogues "en estilo pastoril" (Gómez Manrique, Juan del Encina, Lucas Fernández), and their school, and devotes some seventy pages to a detailed study of the liturgical and secular origins of the drama in Spain. Dr. Kohler has no new material from Spanish archives to offer us, but contents himself with reconsidering the material offered by previous investigators. His familiarity with the bibliography of the subject is noteworthy, and his work will be found useful, if only as a starting-point for future investigations. On many knotty problems of dates, origins and influences, his conclusions are new, and often convincing; that they should always be definitive was not to be expected. When, for instance, in discussing the date of Gómez Manrique's *Representación del Nacimiento de Nuestro Señor*, Kohler observes (p. 4) that from 1458 to 1476 the author was engaged in the wars of the time, and that, therefore, the work referred to must have been written after 1476, he forgets that Gómez Manrique boasted that he could compose "en un día quince ó veinte trobas sin perder sueño, ni dejar de hacer ninguna cosa de las que tenía en cargo," and, at the same time he fails to notice that Gómez Manrique's only dramatic work that can be dated—*Un breve tratado . . . para unos momos*—was acted, or recited, in 1467. Kohler disputes (p. 20) the traditional date of Encina's first eclogue, usually assigned to Christmas, 1492, but overlooks the fact that Encina entered the service of the Duke of Alba in October of that year, and that this eclogue expresses the author's gratitude for his appointment. As the prologue states, Juan, who represents the poet, is "muy alegre y ufano, porque sus señorías le habían ya recibido por suyo." Surely such a statement would only be made in 1492.

The uninspired eclogues reprinted by Kohler are by Hernando de Yanguas, el Bachiller de la Pradilla, Diego de Ávila, Diego Durán, Fernando Díaz and Juan de París; one is anony-

mous (No. iv: "Égloga pastoril nuevamente compuesta, en la qual se introduzen cinco pastores; y el uno es encantador y el vicario del lugar . . ."). Only one has been reprinted in modern times—Diego de Ávila's, published in Gallardo's *El Criticón*, No. 7. About Diego Durán, Kohler can give us no information. Is it possible that he is the poet mentioned in Cervantes' *Canto de Caliope*? If so, his eclogue must have been written about the middle of the sixteenth century, or later.

M. A. B.

The first part of Professor Gerber's treatise on the works of Machiavelli,¹ accompanied by a separate volume of excellent facsimiles and photographs, demands the most respectful attention. The first chapter contends that autograph MSS. can be dated approximately by means of characteristics of the handwriting, and applies this method to 37 MSS. In the following six chapters, the MSS. of the most important works are examined paleographically and historically. The autograph MS. of the *Descrizione del modo tenuto dal duca ecc.*, the only complete MS. of the *Discorsi*, and one MS. of the *Principe* are here employed for the first time. The following conclusions of Professor Gerber illustrate the originality of his work:—The so-called *Frammenti Storici*, the *Nature d'Uomini Fiorentini* and three other documents formerly thought to have been written for use in the *Istorie Fiorentine*, are materials for a prose *Decennale* which was never written. Certain extracts from letters (1497–1499), hitherto ascribed to Machiavelli, are by Marcello Virgilio Adriani. Machiavelli's *Bel-fagor* is the source of the homonymous work by Doni, and, probably, of the work by Brevio. A number of autograph notes to the *Arte della Guerra*, hitherto supposed to belong to the autograph MS., are notes to a lost MS., and the autograph MS. was not used for the Giunti ed. of 1521, while the corrections to the MS. (contrary to the opinion of Lisio) are due to the author himself. The discussion of the rough draught of the preface to the *Discorsi*, and of the relation between the various MSS. of the *Principe*, also lead to entirely new conclusions.

J. E. S.

¹ GERBER, ADOLPH, Niccolò Machiavelli: Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übersetzungen seiner Werke im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, mit 147 Faksimiles und zahlreichen Auszügen. Eine kritisch-bibliographische Untersuchung. Erster Teil: Die Handschriften. Gotha: Druck von F. A. Perthes, Aktiengesellschaft, 1912.